M.M.Kilpatrick Dec23
469 S. 2nd St.,
8) San Jose, Calif.

VOLUME 30 – No. 3 MARCH, 1924

Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant, Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrator.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D., William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.
Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Dyson Hague, D.D., William Phillips Hall, H. W. Bromley, D.D., Edwin W. Caswell, D.D., A. William Lewis, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D.,LL.D., W. E. Biederwolf, D.D., John Roach Straton, D.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., W. M. McPheeters, D.D., J. L. Dickens, D.D.,LL.D., Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D.,Ph.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., Percy George Cross, D.D.

THE BIBLE

THE BIBLE contains—the mind of God, the state of man, the way of Salvation, the doom of sinners, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its histories are true, and its decisions are immutable.

Read the Bible to be wise, believe it to be safe, and practise it to be holy. It contains light to direct you, food to support you, and comfort to cheer you.

The Bible is the traveller's map, the pilgrim's staff, the pilot's compass, the soldier's sword, and the Christian's charter. Here Heaven is opened, and the gates of Hell disclosed.

Christ is the Grand Subject of the Bible, our good its design, and the glory of God its end. It should fill the memory, rule the heart, and guide the feet.

Read it slowly, frequently, prayerfully. It is a mine of wealth, a paradise of glory, and a river of pleasure. It is given you in life, will be opened to you at the Judgment, and be remembered for ever.

The Bible involves the highest responsibility, will reward the greatest labour, and condemn all who trifle with its sacred contents.—*Christian Courier.*

FRANK J. BOYER. PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price $2.00 the Year Canada $2.25, Foreign $2.35 Single Copy 20 Cents

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

CONTENTS—FEBRUARY, 1924

EDITORIAL

Fooled the Publisher 121
Modernism—Is it Ignorance or Duplicity?—*Wm. H. Bates, D.D.* 122
The Gospel according to Pontius Pilate—*David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D.* 123
A Clarifying Statement—*D. S. Kennedy, D.D.* 126
A Militant Scientist—*Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D.* 127
Was Albert Bateson Misunderstood?—*Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D.* 129
Was it a Frank Report? 130
The Testimony of Dr. Briggs 131
A Characteristic of the New Paganism—*D. S. Kennedy, D.D.* 132
Reading the Bible—*D. S. Kennedy, D.D.* 133
Quit You Like Men, be Strong—*David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D.* 134
Christ's Birth—*D. S. Kennedy, D.D.* 135
Bible Study—*David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D.* 136
Modernism a Fashion—*D. S. Kennedy, D.D.* 137
Notes and Comments 138

THE ARENA

What the Modernists Lack—*Professor J. S. Keyser, D.D.* 147
Saint James—*William H. Bates, D.D.* 151
The Great Book—*Christopher G. Hazard, D.D.* 155
The Council of Hades—A Story—*Henry J. Zelley, D.D.* 156
Dr. G. W. McPherson's Book on the Virgin Birth—*Cromwell Childe* 161
Religion in Reach—*Lawrence Keister, D.D.* 163
A Bit of Half Century-Old History—*By A Contemporary* 165
The Truth of God *vs.* the Wisdom of this World 166
Bibles or Libels?—*G. B. F. Hallock, D.D.* 167

THE SANCTUARY

The Witness of the Spirit—*William H. Bates, D.D.* 168

FLASHLIGHTS—*Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D.* 173

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE—*A. William Lewis, D.D.* 176

LIBRARY TABLE—*Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D.* 178

Important Instructions: **All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.**

Change in Address—It is very important that **Old** as well as **New** address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expiration and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

Collapse of Evolution

By Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail.

A beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press.

Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give your friends.

Price 20c each; $2.25 per dozen; $17 per 100—Prepaid at these prices.

ALTAR AND RING

A Wedding-Day Souvenir

COMPILED BY G. B. F. HALLOCK, D.D.

There is nothing on the market to equal it at the price. A very pretty booklet, having an *artistic, heavy, stiff, white cover, with a pretty up-to-date stamp in Aluminum.* Printed on a *very heavy enameled book paper and silver edged.* Each book is packed in a box, for safe mailing and presentation. Size 6½x7½.

This book is not a mere jumble of poetry, but has an idea running thru it; it begins with suggestions on courtship, then the ceremony, then the congratulations of friends, etc. The poems celebrating the all-important occasions appeal to heart and mind alike in words of tender sympathy and counsel for the newly-wedded pair.

READ THIS

I am much pleased with them; the arrangements are unique, and the selections are very appropriate.—*Rev. Edwin Genge.*

In sending a duplicate order for a dozen of ALTAR AND RING, a prominent minister says: "If ministers only knew what a beautiful book it is, they would go like hot cakes."

Single copy, 50 cents; 6 copies, $2.50; 12 copies, $5.00, prepaid. Your money back if you want it.

Other Booklet Wedding Day Souvenirs

BRIDAL SOUVENIR—A brief modern handbook on the relation of husband and wife, 86 pp., white cloth, beautiful gold and tint design, 6x4¼ inches. Each in box, 60 cents. Special price, 50c net, postpaid.

THE WEDDING DAY, by Bishop John F. Hurst, D.D., cloth, 60c—special price, 50c. Beautifully bound in white cloth, white gilt edges. Size page, 5⅛x7. Gives the Service, the Marriage Certificate, and Words of Counsel. Yours, while they last, at 50c. prepaid.

Typewriter Ribbon
Typewriter Carbon Paper

The Best Ribbon we know of at the price. High grade, non-filling, full length, permanent colors in any climate, perfect edge. Any writer using narrow ribbon, at **75c**, prepaid.

The Best Carbon Paper we know of at the price—black, blue or purple. High grade, smooth and even.

25 sheet 60c; 50 sheet $1.10; 100 sheet $2. All prepaid.

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book Racks, Tables, Communion Ware—EVERYTHING. The finest furniture made. Direct from our factory to your church. Catalog free. DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dpt. 79, Greenville, Ill.

Biological Evolution — Its Antidote. Four Sermons by John A. Hoffman. Price, 20 cents, postpaid.

Says Dr. Forsyth of the Methodist Church: "Your sermons will be of great help to those of our preachers who have not as yet found their bearings on these much-discussed matters."

Dr. John O. Streeter, Church of the Brethren: "The best for its size that I have found."

John A. Hoffman, Nezperce, Idaho

Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price 50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D.D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Funeral Sermons

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons for Funeral Occasions, contributed by fifty different ministers, like No. 4. It also contains fifty carefully selected Texts for Funeral Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Sermons on the Lord's Prayer

By J. C. Hornberger, D.D. .....Price, 10c

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject,, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, and you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of a subject, a happily selected cluster of Scripture texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address."—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Penna.

Worth While Pamphlets

Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for $2.50

Constructive Studies in John, Dr.Gregory 50c edition, now 35c each, ordozen for 2.50

NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or $3.00 per doz. These 2 volumes are of inestimable value to Preachers and Bible Students.

The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for 1.50

The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisement, 10c each, per dozen..... .75

Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6 ea., doz. .50

The Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for .40

Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for.... .75

Biblical Giving, Smith, 5c each, or per dozen ..... .50

Cloth Bound Books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at $1.25 and $1.50

Your choice while they last at 50c— 3 books for $1.25, prepaid

God-Man—Search and Manifestation
Sword and Garment
The Arena and the Throne

ART AND MORALITY

Beautiful, cloth, 81pp; Price 25 cents prepaid

A frank treatise by a papular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. The author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of this humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor. *The Western Christian Advocate* says it is "sterling in sense."

FROM PULPIT TO POOR-HOUSE

Cloth, 204pp. Thousands sold at $1.00. Will close out at halfprice—50c.

The Story that made the Old Minister a Pastor Emeritus. Dr. Jay Benson Hamilton's stories that started the Veteran's Movement in Methodism and told by him in over 2,000 churches.

The romance is so real as to be a recital of sad facts with many sad illustrations.—Lutheran Observer.

A pathetic and powerful plea. It cannot help having a profound and lasting effect.—Congregationalist.

We defy any person with a soul to read ten pages in it without laughter and tears.—Nashville Chr. Advocate.

Well worth reading, written in a vivid and sometimes most sarcastic style.—Episcopal Recorder.

A combination of history and romance. It states the case with fiery eloquence, not to say vehemence.—The Independent.

Champion Bound Volumes

We are fortunate to have several Bible Champions from 1908 to 1912 to sell at half price, to close out lot. All cloth bound, and prepaid.

1908, in 2 volumes, per Vol.....$1.00
1909, only 1 Vol.—Jan. to June.....$1.00
1910, in 2 volumes, per Vol.....$1.00
1911, and to April, 1912, in 1 Vol.....$1.00

New Series Champion Bound Volumes

1918, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.25
1919, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.25
1920, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.25
1921, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.25
1922, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.50
1923, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.....$2.50

Bound Homiletic Volumes

FOR MINISTERS

Every volume listed below will prove valuable and very suggestive. Each contains an abundance of available material for pulpit preparation for Ordinary, and almost every conceivable Special, Occasion, completely indexed.

Of several years we have only a few volumes left. It will be difficult to procure these volumes after our supply is sold out.

As a test, to convince yourself, order a single volume. There is nothing more helpful; there is nothing so inexpensive!

Bound Volumes of the Preachers Assistant, a Homiletical Magazine, Leather Binding, about 500pp, any volume from 1890 to 1905, prepaid.....$1.75
Any 10 volumes for.....$15.00

Bound Volumes Preachers Magazine, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 570pp, any volume from 1891 to 1901, prepaid....$1.25
Any 10 volumes for.....$10.00

Bound Volumes The Sermonizer, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 380pp, any volume from 1911 to 1916, prepaid.....$1.75
The 6 volumes for.....$10.00

Bound Volumes The Sermonizer, in enlarged form, bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 475pp, vol. 1917 or 1918, prepaid.....$2.25
Both volumes for.....$4.25

We have quite a lot of left over numbers of The Sermonizer — a Homiletic Magazine we published for years. Each number contains Sermons, outlines of Sermons, and many articles of a purely Homiletic nature. The material in every single number is as fresh for use now as at any time. Several numbers of this magazine will be as valuable to a minister as a volume costing many times the price of these magazines.

We will mail them to you at **10c** per copy. If 12 numbers are ordered at one time $1.00 for the 12. Try a few numbers—their value will surprise you.

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 30 MARCH, 1924 No. 3

Fooled the Publisher!

Last month I gave a perfectly good full age to show those whose subscriptions are ue, or overdue, why they should pay up!

I didn't say it in just that gruff way, but meant about the same!

Well, What Happened?

I'm ashamed to tell—but I sure *was* disppointed!

I was vain enough to imagine all my riends would read that page, look at their ddress Label, and those owing would run or a Money Order or write out a check Inanter!

But only a very few did this!

And, those few—Lor' Bless 'em—have my est Thanks and Blessing!

The rest of 'em?

Well, I know it was just plain, everyday, oughtlessness on their part.

If those who owe will *Now* Remit at once ey'll have my blessing, also!

But that means if they remit Right Now!

Or, if any one knows how to produce a hampion every month without money, tell e Quick! I'll cheerfully do all the work r Nothing—and you'll get the Champion r nothing—Gratis!

But if you don't know, or wont tell how, en send your subscription Quick!

The printer *must* be paid, promptly, every month. Don't compel me to throw up my hands and quit!

Please Note that this message is not intended for those of my friends whose subscription is paid up and in advance—only for those who have been thoughtless enough to permit themselves not to attend to the important matter of remitting for their subscription.

On your Address Label, right back of your name, is printed the month and year your subscription is paid to; thus:

Mr.Always Prompt Mar24
Hustletown,Pa.

Mar24, at the end of first line, means you are paid up to March, 1924, and now owe to March, 1925.

If your Label shows date prior to Mar24 your regret should be in proportion to the length of time overdue!

Remember, the BIBLE CHAMPION subscription price is $2.00 in *Advance.*

It is our ambition to serve you well. We believe you appreciate this.

We get stacks of letters telling us how much the CHAMPION means to those who write. And this is mighty encouraging.

But if we are to continue we must have your hearty co-operation.

Is this asking too much?

Your action will indicate your rectitude.

THE PUBLISHER.

Encouraging—I can't close this letter without saying a word for the CHAMPION. It is the joy of my life! On its arrival I grab it and stay right with it until I have finished every article. Say, but old brother Bates is some war-horse! When he and Dr. Keyser get through with the Modernist there is hardly a speck left of him! I wish I had money to subscribe for a number of my brethren—I often talk to them about the CHAMPION.—*Rev. R. L. Kinnaird.*

I find the CHAMPION of great value, and although I do not at all exhaust any one of the issues as they come to me, I do not let any one of them get away from me for long, feeling that I must use them much more later. So I wish to thank you for editing into it much material of abiding worth—*Chas. A. Wolcott, Esq.*

EDITORIAL

Modernism--Is it Ignorance or Duplicity?

A DEBATE has recently been staged in New York City, the disputants being the Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton, one of our Contributing Editors and pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church there, and the Rev. Dr. Charles Francis Potter, an apostate Baptist minister and pastor of the West Side Unitarian Church.

The question at issue was, "Resolved that the Bible is the Infallible Word of God." Dr. Straton is a Fundamentalist, and of course took the affirmative. Dr. Potter is a Modernist, and, true to modernist form, sided in with unbelievers and infidels in their undermining and destructive assaults upon the Scriptures. Arguments and instances he brought up to invalidate the Bible have been answered over and over again so completely and irrefutably that it seems contemptible for any man claiming intelligence to adduce them at this late day; and one cannot but question whether it is ignorance or duplicity that would lead a disputant to do it.

One of his instances against the infallibility of the Bible is the alleged contradiction in these two passages:

2 Sam. vi. 23, *Therefore Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child unto the day of her death."*

2 Sam. xxi. 8, *"The five sons of Michal, the daughter of Saul."*

Of course if, as is said, Michal "had no child," and also if she had "five sons," there must be a serious error in the record which would invalidate it. Let us use a little intelligence.

According to 1 Sam. xviii., David's prowess in battle won for him a wife, Michal, king Saul's daughter. This was B. C. 1063. It was probably the next year, B. C., 1062, that Saul, for some reason, took Michal away from David, and gave her to Phalti, the son of Laish." 1 Sam. xxv. 44. In B. C. 1048, David, by his brother-in-law, Ishbosheth, recovered his wife Michal from Phalti, 2 Sam. iii. 15. She thus lived with Phalti 14 years.

Six years later, B. C. 1042, David having meanwhile become king, his unseemly exhibition of himself in dancing before the restored Ark of the Lord, 2 Sam. vi. 14, brought upon him the contempt of his wife; for the unwifely expression of which, there came, as is implied in the word "therefore," this judgment: *"Therefore* Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child unto the day of her death." Accordingly, *her non-child bearing must be reckoned from the time of David's saltatory performance in B. C.* 1042. This is perfectly plain.

But Michal had "five sons." Sure. When were they born? Of course before this judgment of sterility came upon her. This is perfectly plain, too. The time for their birth—if such events were legitimate and above board, as of course they were—was during her 14 years of marital life with Phalti. Thus the alleged contradiction instantly disappears, and the Bible record stands, not in the least invalidated, but confirmed.

Our conclusion is clinched by an event that must be reckoned with.

In 2 Sam. xxi. 1-6, is an account of the expiation of king Saul's crime against the Gibeonites. Seven sons of the house of Saul were to be immolated, and it fell to David to select them. He would hardly have given his own sons, but the conditions could be fulfilled by surrendering the five sons of Michal —who were "of the house of Saul"—with the two sons of Rizpah, Saul's concubine, 2 Sam. xxi. 8. And so it was done.

Thus, not only is there no contradiction, but the childlessness in the one case, and the five sons in the other, are fully accounted for.

All his other Old Testament instances can easily be answered quite as conclusively.

In the New Testament he instanced the differing superscriptions on the cross, Matt. xxvii. 37, Mark xv. 20, Luke xxiii. 28, John xix. 19, as proving the fallibility of the Bible. At a meeting of a certain ministerial association a Congregational clergyman who claimed to be a modernist adduced these superscriptions as a case of discrepancy for which he could see no possibility of solution. We wrote out and sent him our answer to the difficulty, which he gracefully acknowledged to be satisfactory, and he has presumably ceased to instance these as discrepant, although you can never tell what a modernist will or will not do, to make a point against the Bible. This answer was published as an

editorial in the CHAMPION, January 1922, page 55.

He instanced James i. 13, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither empteth he any man," and Genesis xxii. 1, "God did tempt Abraham," as a case of contradiction. In an editorial on "Temptation," in the CHAMPION, November 1920, page 448, this difficulty was completely solved.

A number of other difficulties he adduced as showing the fallibility of the Bible have been irrefutably solved in articles in the CHAMPION. We do wish modernists would infuse common sense into their boasted but bunk scholarship.—*W. H. B.*

The BIBLE CHAMPION has been a great blessing and help to me in my work. To me the CHAMPION is the best and most wholesome magazine now published. Truly every minister would be greatly profited and strengthened if he had it in his study. We wish you God's richest blessing and the CHAMPION greatest success in the coming year.—*Rev. W. J. Wienands.*

The Gospel According to Pontius Pilate

I AM sorry for any man who falls down in the face of a great opportunity. Pilate was such a man; one of the kind that "lets I dare not wait upon I would." A question of stupendous importance before him—the greatest that ever beats at our doors—and, oward that he was, instead of doing what e knew was right, he weakly appealed to an xcited mob.

The first time this man ever saw Jesus, o far as we know, was on this April morn-ng, when the mob with Jesus in its hands ame surging across the bridge that spanned he Tyropoean Valley and presented itself efore the gates of the Pretorium clamoring or an audience. If Pilate was out of humor, y reason of this unseemly interruption of his orning rest, he did not show it. Like the olitician that he was, he met his petitioners ith a smile, and took in the situation at a lance. He had heard of Jesus frequently, o doubt, but scarcely expected to see him in is guise; a prisoner, worn and haggard from weary night of suffering, with a hempen ope about his neck and his hands bound be-ind him.

Pilate said, "What accusation bring ye gainst this man?"

The answer was imperatively curt and inso-nt: "If he were not an evil doer we should ot have brought him unto thee."

In fact the charge against Jesus was two-old: On the one hand, Treason, in that he aimed to be a king; and on the other Blas-hemy, in that he claimed to be equal with od. The latter charge, being distinctly re-gious, lay outside the purview of the Gover-nor; but of the other, as one of Caesar's magistrates, he was bound to take cognizance. He therefore led Jesus aside and questioned him.

"Art thou the King of the Jews?"

The answer was an emphatic affirmative. "Thou sayest," but immediately Jesus added, "My kingdom is not of this world. To this end was I born and for this cause came I unto the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

At the close of this interview Pilate brought his prisoner forth and pronounced what should have been a definite sentence of acquittal, "I find no fault in him at all."

The mob was thereby kindled into new fury and demanded with ominous urgency the death of the prisoner.

Pilate was at his wits' end? What *could* he do?

The fact that Jesus was a Galilean suggested an escape from the dilemma. At this time Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee, was visiting in Jerusalem; and as the prisoner properly belonged in his jurisdiction the perplexing case was turned over to him.

But Pilate reckoned without his host. The sobriquet of Herod was "that Fox"; and he was far too clever to be caught napping in any such way. As a matter of curiosity he was glad to see Jesus, "because he had heard concerning him"; but he declined officially to have anything to do with him. He gave him over to a guard of soldiers, who, having set at nought and mocked him, restored him to the mob. Thus he returned to Pilate, arrayed in cast-off purple. What could the poor time-serving Governor do with him?

A happy thought! Its was the custom to release a prisoner at the Passover. He will give the people the choice between two: "Whom will ye that I release unto you; Barabbas, the murderer, or this Jesus?"

They shout with one accord: "Barabbas."

"What then," he asks, "shall I do with Jesus that is called the Christ?"

"Crucify him! Crucify him! Away with him!"

Alas, was ever man in such a quandary before? *What* shall he do?

He will compromise. His prisoner being innocent, should in common justice be released offhand; but says Pilate, "I will chastise him and let him go."

The proposition is a travesty of logic as well as justice and the people so regard it. "Thou art not Caesar's friend," they say, "if thou let him go!"

Then the last subterfuge. Seeing that he prevails nothing, but that the tumult rather increases, he takes water and washes his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man: see ye to it."

And they lead their prisoner forth to the place which is called Golgotha, where they crucify him.

All this is ancient history. Let us bring it up to date. The unavoidable question is: "What shall I do with this Jesus which is called the Christ?" It obtrudes itself upon the mind and conscience of every man. It is the question that will not down. The issues of life and death are involved in it. How will *you* dispose of it?

First: Will you do nothing with it?

That is impossible. In the midst of Pilate's perplexity, in the presence of the multitude, a messenger came and placed a note in his hand. *"My dear husband, I have suffered many things this night in a dream concerning the prisoner now before thee. I pray thee, have nothing to do with this just man. Thy loving wife, Claudia."* I doubt not, Pilate smiled grimly as he read this, saying to himself, "How like a woman. Would it were possible!"

No man can thus ignore the question. It thrusts itself upon him. Go where he will, into the home-circle, the market-place, the library, Chamber of Commerce or Legislative Hall, the name of Jesus is heard everywhere above every other name, and the eyes of Jesus, like those in the portrait by Fra Angelico, follow him wherever he goes, silently demanding, "What will you do with me?"

Second: You may reject him.

On what ground? The only rational ground is that he was an impostor. If on a fair consideration of the question you have reached the conclusion that Christ was not what he claimed to be you are bound to reject him. In so doing you can have at least the satisfaction of knowing that you are consistent, whatever the consequences may be. And indeed it is a thousand-fold more courageous to deal with the question in this manner than to palter with it. However, in a ministry of fifty years, we have never personally known but one man who was willing thus frankly to reject him.

Not even the average infidel is prepared to say that Jesus was a wilful deceiver. "I have been reading the four gospels," said Diderot in a group of fellow free-thinkers, "and notwithstanding what we have been saying about this diabolical book, I defy you, or all of you together, to produce a tale so simple, so touching and so powerful as the story of the life, passion and death of this carpenter who is called the Christ of God."

"In his bosom," wrote Theodore Parker, "was the mightiest heart that ever beat. What wisdom was his, what deep divinity of soul. Measure him by the shadow he has cast into the world, nay, rather, by the light he has shed upon it."

"He remains," said David Strauss, "the highest model of religion within our thought; and perfect piety is impossible save as we have his presence in our hearts."

"Whatever may be the surprises of the future," wrote Renan, "this Jesus will never be surpassed; his worship will grow young without ceasing, his legend will call forth tears without end, his sufferings will melt the noblest hearts and all ages will proclaim that among the children of men there is none born greater than he."

In view of such concessions made by leading representatives of unbelief, it is submitted that thoughtful people must find it difficult to pronounce Jesus an impostor and, on this ground, to reject him.

Third: You may try to compromise the case.

But this also is impossible, since, in view of the stupendous claims of Jesus, there can be no middle ground. He was either an impostor or he was what he claimed to be.

To say that he was a good man and nothing

more is to violate every rule in the canon of reason and common sense. Is it possible to pronounce a man "good" or "honest," whose whole life was spent in attempting to vindicate his equality with God?

To an earnest youth who once ran and prostrated himself before him, saying, "Good Rabbi, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" he replied, "Why callest thou me 'good'? There is none good but one; that is God. The alternative is thus presented: He either was not good, or he was what he claimed to be, namely the co-equal Son of God. As for "Good Rabbi," he would have none of it. The youth must either go forward or go back. And the same is true of all those who deny the Deity of Christ while professing to believe in him. This is to put him to an open shame; it is to crown him with thorns, clothe him in ribald purple and place an impotent reed in his hands; it is to smite him in the face and cry like his old-time prosecutors: "Hail, King of the Jews!"

Fourth: One may temporize with the question. And this indeed is the way many people are treating it.

In the Judgment Hall at Caesarea—where Paul reasoned of "righteousness, temperance and judgment to come," in a discourse which centered in the great proposition which Paul was ever advocating, to wit, "This Jesus is the Christ"—it is related that Felix trembled and said, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a more convenient season I will call for thee." But the convenient season never came; nor can any man be assured that it ever will come. It is a true proverb: "The path of By-an-by leads to the town of Never." This is the way men die. They do not mean to reject the overtures of mercy, but, fully intending at some time or other to accept Christ as their Saviour, they never do.

Is it not singular that the average man is so much more careful and scrupulous in meeting the opportunities and responsibilities of secular life than those in the province of spiritual things? In a brokers' office where many clerks are employed, you may read this placard on the wall, "Do it now." Do what now? Sell or invest. But here is a question of investment that reaches out into eternal issues; and it clamors for an immediate answer. Why not, then, "do it now"?

Fifth: One may end the controversy by accepting Christ.

This is the last alternative, and, unless there is some flaw in our argument, it is the only safe and rational conclusion for any man.

What is it to accept Christ? It is to receive him as our Priest, our Prophet and our King; and that without reserve. It is to make a complete surrender to him, saying, "Thee my new Master now I call, and consecrate to thee my all."

No halfway measures will answer. He will have all or nothing. His only terms are complete and unconditional surrender. To become a Christian is to resolve to stand for Christ, to follow him and live for him.

At the time of the Paris Exposition, an American girl lay dying in one of the hotels in Paris. As the end drew near she had some desire upon her heart which she tried vainly to express. The only word which those who were gathered at her bedside could distinguish was "Bring." At length she succeeded in saying, "Bring forth the——" and then they knew. She wanted them to sing:

> All hail the power of Jesus' name;
> Let angels prostrate fall;
> Bring forth the royal diadem,
> And crown Him Lord of all.

Aye, crown him Lord of all! Let all life's crowns, its hopes and purposes, its plans and aspirations be brought and laid before him!

This is the only answer that any thoughtful man can honestly give to the question: *What shall I do with this Jesus which is called the Christ?*

One of Lincoln's wise sayings was: "Nothing is settled until it is settled right." The man, who, like Pilate, undertakes to evade responsibility by taking refuge in excuses and subterfuges, will find himself perplexed and harassed perpetually until he disposes of the matter by either rejecting Christ or frankly and unreservedly accepting him.

The appeal is an imperative one. When Pompilius was sent by the Roman Senate to require of Antiochus that he should withdraw his army from Egypt, the latter answered, "I will consider"; whereupon Antiochus drew a circle with his sword, saying, "I am commissioned to require you to consider and decide before you cross this line."

The word Now is a little one, but what infinite possibilities are wrapped up in it!

Christ is at the door. To let this moment pass without opening is to take desperate chances. *Not to decide is to decide not.* To put the decision off is but to add another to the long procession of wasted opportunities. Wherefore ponder and pray; and if the Lord says, "Come and follow me," answer thoughtfully and devoutly, "I will— I do!"—D. J. B.

A Clarifying Statement

THE *Christian Century* is, perhaps, the best edited and most influential weekly organ of religious modernism published in this country. Even though we may question its right to call itself an "interpreter of essential Christianity," we cannot withhold our admiration of the ability and outspokenness with which it commends its views. Better an open enemy than an equivocal friend.

Such a paper is, of course, openly antagonistic to "Fundamentalism." It seems, however, that it is only recently that its eyes have been fully opened to the gravity of the issue between Fundamentalism and Modernism. At any rate, it is only recently that it has given a clear expression of its realization of what is involved. This expression it gives in its issue of January 3, 1924, in an editorial, entitled "Fundamentalism and Modernism: Two Religions"—an expression that leaves little to be desired. We commend it to the attention of those in our churches, whether they call themselves liberals or conservatives, who would have us believe that nothing much is involved in this controversy, that "the opposing groups are really not contradictory, but complementary." It is in complete harmony with the position long maintained by THE CHAMPION—and which has perhaps received fullest expression in Dr. Machen's "Christianity and Liberalism"—that at root the controversy is between those who are Christians and those who are not Christians. We welcome this editorial, because it seems to us that the sooner this is generally perceived, the better it will be. When once this is perceived, there is no doubt in our minds on what side of the controversy all those who love the Lord in all sincerity and heartiness will be found. The great trouble now, it seems to us, is that the rank and file even of the ministry are not awake to the danger that threatens. We could wish that our space permitted us to reprint this editorial as a whole. We can, however, only give our readers the more essential passages. We trust that the reader will keep constantly in mind the fact that we are quoting from a modernist organ. Apart from a phrase here and there, these passages sound so much like passages that have appeared in THE CHAMPION that if they appeared in a different context, without quotation marks, some of our readers might suppose we had reprinted one of our old editorials.

It is deeply significant, it seems to us, that *The Christian Century* says editorially:

"How deep-going is the fundamentalist-modernist controversy? Is it an issue worth serious attention? Does it matter vitally which way it comes out? . . . Are the fundamentalists right in claiming that the issue is a grave one, going to the roots of religious conviction and involving the basic purposes and almost the genius of Christianity?

"A candid reply to such inquiries must be one in agreement with the fundamentalist claim. It is to be doubted that the average churchman whose sympathies are in the main with modernism has any adequate appreciation of the sharpness and depth of the issue, and it would seem that the time has come to say to the rank and file of church folk and of the religiously disposed outside the churches, that the differences between fundamentalism and modernism are not mere surface differences, which can be amiably waived aside or disregarded, but that they are foundation differences, structural differences, amounting in their radical dissimilarity almost to the differences between two distinct religions. The fact that the modernist and the fundamentalist groups both call themselves Christians, both derive their theological standards from the historic traditions of the Christian church, and are both sheltered under the roofs of the same ecclesiastical institutions, should not blind any one to the profound disparity which characterizes not only their respective intellectual processes, but their objective goals, and even their spiritual experiences. Two world-views, two moral ideals, two sets of personal attitudes, have clashed, and it is a case of ostrich-like intelligence blindly to deny and evade the searching and serious character of the issue. Christianity, according to fundamentalism, is one religion. Christianity, according to modernism, is another religion. Which is the true Christian religion, is the question to be settled in all probability by our generation for future generations. . . . Christianity is hardly likely to last much longer half fundamentalist and half modernist. It is not merely the aggressiveness of fundamentalism that is forcing a choice, it is the inherent nature of the issue itself.

"Two worlds have crashed, the world of tradition and the world of modernism. One is scholastic, static, authoritarian, individualistic; the other is vital, dynamic, free, social. There is a clash here as profound and as grim as that between Christianity and Confucionism. Amiable words cannot hide the differences. 'Blest be the tie' may be sung until doom's day, but it cannot bind these two worlds together. The God of the fundamentalist is one God; the God of the modernist is another. The Christ of the fundamentalist is one Christ; the Christ of modernism is

nother. The Bible of fundamentalism is one ible; the Bible of modernism is another. The urch, the kingdom, the salvation, the consumation of all things—these are one thing to fundmentalists and another thing to the modernists. Vhich God is the Christian God, which Christ is ie Christian Christ, which Bible is the Christian ible, which church, which kingdom, which salation, which consummation, are the Christian hurch, the Christian kingdom, the Christian salation, the Christian consummation? The future ill tell. But that the issue is clear and that the herent incompatibility of the two worlds has assed the stage of mutual tolerance is a fact oncerning which there hardly seems room for ny one to doubt."

We confess that, to us, it is passing strange that the writer of this editorial does not accept the "fundamentalist conclusion that the division in the churches is inevitable," seeing that he maintains that "the moment is long since due for believers in the modernist conception of Christianity to recognize and reverently to deal with the fact that there exists in present-day Christianity two structurally distinct religions, irreconcilable not only on the side of apologetics, but of churchly function and ideal and of missionary propaganda"; but apart from this, it seems to us that this is a noteworthy editorial, and one well fitted to clarify the existing situation in the religious world.—*D. S. K.*

A Militant Scientist

A SOMEWHAT belligerent advocate of evolution is Dr. J. P. McMurrich, a professor of anatomy in Toronto University. He shows neither a generous spirit nor a judicial mind. Whenever men grow excited and ecome adjectival they prove that their emoions are beginning to cloud their judgment. o it is with Dr. McMurrich.

At the Cincinnati meeting of the American cademy for the Advancement of Science ast December he called the opponents of evoution by the polite term, "ignorant." Was hat right? One of the most ungracious hings a man can do is to call people "ignoant," when they do not agree with him.

But why should the anti-evolutionists be 'ignorant"? Have they not the same sources f information at hand that others have? If hey have the money, they can buy the books f the evolutionists and read them. Or they nay have access to them in the college and ublic libraries. Our own book-shelves are airly groaning under the weight of the most ecent books written by the purveyors of the volutionary hypothesis, the latest being dated December, 1923. (This article is being writen on January 26, 1924.)

The evolutionists are certainly vocal nough. They give many addresses on their obby on public platforms and in college and niversity classrooms. They also have the *uror scribendi,* like some of the rest of us, nd are writing articles and books *galore.* Why do they make their addresses and pubish their writings? Do they not expect them o be heard and read? If they do, do they ot want them to be understood? It is not likely that they want their learned tomes to be placed on obscure book-shelves to be dust-covered and moth-eaten. Well, if they write them to be read and understood, why do they think that those who read them are in the bondage of "ignorance"? Come, let us have done with this cheap and crude kind of contention, and get down to the business of looking facts squarely in the face like cool-minded honest men in search of the truth.

In a recent interview, reported quite amply in a New York journal, Dr. McMurrich calls the opponents of evolution "obstructionists." That is another of those kindly epithets that the evolutionists are fond of flinging at those who differ with them. They seem to have no humility, and speak as if "wisdom would die with them." But we would meekly inquire why those who cannot accept evolution as a proven scientific fact are "obstructionists." It seems to us that the only thing they "obstruct" is the unproven speculations and assumptions of certain scientists. Whenever a scientist discovers a real fact about which there can be no doubt, the conservative believer gladly accepts it and makes proper acknowledgment. But he certainly should not be called unkind names when he cannot see his way clear to accept the guesses of some men as to what took place many millions of years ago. Not a soul on earth can tell that with any degree of certainty. Think of calling people "ignorant" and "obstructionists" on a count like that! Cannot the scientist himself see that to demand of us to accept such speculations is stretching our faith to the point of credulity? But in matters of science

we want facts, clearly demonstrated, not a papistic demand upon our faith faculty.

Moreover, it seems unreasonable to call men "obstructionists" because they cannot believe that man descended from animals far below the scale of lemurs, monkeys and chimpanzees; or because they cannot greet the present-day apes as cousins, uncles and aunts; or because they feel jarred by the assertion that it "took man's ancestors about a million years to learn to walk on their hind legs!" What is so amazingly uplifting about such a view that a man must be regarded as an "obstructionist" because he cannot swallow it? Who is going to be made better and nobler by this sub-ape hypothesis? Where are the men and women being saved from sin unto righteousness by believing it? We know many men and women who have been "born from above" through faith in the Bible and its Christ. We do not know one person who has been improved in his morals or manners by faith in the evolution theory. On the other hand, acceptance of that theory usually makes its possessor vain and contemptuous; gives him a supercilious air; and causes him to call other people hard names.

To our mind, the view that man was created directly in the divine image, as the Bible so beautifully teaches, and therefore made a rational being for a high and worthwhile purpose and destiny, is the view that is likely to give men an exalted conception of their value and significance.

But the anti-evolutionists "simply refuse to accept evidence." So avers Dr. McMurrich. We raise the question, why should they be so perverse? This means that they are dishonest, and that implication again is ungenerous and unworthy of the scientific mind.

But suppose we glance at some of our professor's "evidence." He says that "the missing link," the stock joke of a generation ago, "was a myth." But the scientists of that day —the days of Darwin and Huxley—believed that "the missing link" would some day be found, and scientists have been looking for it with eager quest ever since. Now they are in the Gobi Desert hunting for it. Thus it would seem that there are "myths" also in the realm of science. What was regarded a generation ago as scientific reality today is held to be a "myth." Thus do scientists change their views in a few brief years.

Evolution is a gradual process, says our scientist. There are gaps, it is true, but that proves nothing. So he continues.

But if evolution is a gradual process, and yet there are gaps, then, by that very sign, there must be innumerable "missing links." So it would seem that "missing links" are not a myth, after all!

But do those gaps prove nothing? Yes, they prove this—that evolution is not established on a scientific or factual basis. Since those gaps are not filled in reality, they must be filled by the imagination; but that method is not science.

We quote directly from the evolutionist: "There is a big gap between man and the ape, but less than between the ape and the monkey. I mean that the difference is less between man and the highest ape than between the highest ape and the lowest monkey. I am speaking anatomically, of course."

But the last sentence, ending in that offhand phrase, "of course," is the crucial matter. Anatomical analogies and differences are of small consequence. True, in his body man bears many similarities to the mineral, the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. He was so created, because His Maker intended him to be a denizen of the earth and therefore made him to fit organically into his environment. But it is man's mind that is the all-important consideration. Man is a rational, moral and spiritual personality, capable of endless progress and possibility. We venture to say that the gap mentally and morally between the highest ape and the lowest monkey is *nil*. But look at the gap in these respects between man and the ape.

Our professor repeats what has been said so often—that man has not descended from any living monkey or ape; man and his simian relatives are only "offshoots" of the same bestial stock. But the scientists ought to see that this recourse does not help matters, for there must be a continuous line somewhere for both man and monkey. We think it would be more reasonable to believe that this line runs right down on through the whole simian relationship. That would establish a better continuity and would lessen the number of unbridgable gaps. What advantage is there in disclaiming an ape-ancestry, and then turning right around and claiming a sub-ape ancestry?

Unlike most of the scientists of the past generation and some today, Dr. McMurrich believes in the multiple origin of man. Some time in the remote past—say, five or ten million years ago, the *exact* figures are inconsequential for "exact science"—a number of different animals took a notion to develop a

humanoid propensity, and thus brought into existence all the various races of mankind. But there is no scientific proof at hand for this view. Moreover, it differs from the scientific view of the past, showing again how often speculative science has to change front.

Then Dr. McMurrich brings forward the shop-worn and oft-exposed Trinil, Piltdown, Neanderthal and Cro-magnon men. He says that they "make a pretty good series; they fit pretty well. Not continuously, of course. There are great gaps." They are "not in exactly related progression, either. But then there were undoubtedly several lines of descent, and some of these skulls have been on collateral instead of direct lines."

All of which fatal admissions increase, *ad infinitum,* the number of "missing links," and render the theory a thousand times more improbable and remove it many times further from scientific demonstration. And yet we are called hard names because we do not bow meekly to the dictates of the evolution hierarchy!—*L. S. K.*

Was Albert Bateson Misunderstood?

PROFESSOR Albert Bateson has been making a strenuous effort to set himself right with the scientific guild. A recent number of *Science* published his disclaimer and defense. But he employs so much circumlocution and expresses himself so vaguely, one feels that his efforts at explanation are pretty much of a failure. He does not seem to be expert in helping himself out of a dilemma. His permitting himself to grow heated and turning upon his opponents with the charge of "obscurantism," does not indicate quite as much scientific poise and detachment as we should like to see.

Dr. Bateson seems to think that he was misunderstood or misrepresented by the people who are opposed to evolution; at least, that they have taken an undue advantage of his frank admissions at the Toronto meeting of scientists some time ago.

But we beg to assure him and the other vocal evolutionists that he was perfectly understood, and his views were correctly represented by the opponents of the evolution theory. Every intelligent person knew that, in spite of his concessions, he still held on to evolution; for he said so plainly and unequivocally. But he also declared that scientists today knew nothing for certain as to the origin of species; knew less, indeed, than they thought they did away back in the palmy days of Darwinism; and therefore he said that the evolutionists, instead of being able to treat the genesis of species by evolution as a proved fact, had to accept the theory "by faith." He also advised them to lay theorizing aside, and devote themselves to the study of facts as they are. That is, they should stick to empiricism, and not launch out into unproved speculations. And Dr. Bateson was right in saying these things, and it was honest in him to say them.

Of course, the anti-evolutionists saw their opportunity and took full and free advantage of those frank concessions on the part of a well-known British scientist; and this they had a right to do, and they did it in the interest of both science and religion. The reason for their feelings of elation is not far to seek. For a number of years the evolutionists of this country had been announcing, *ex cathedra,* that their theory had been established beyond peradventure, while all persons who doubted or opposed it were belabored with vehement epithets, and treated as "ignoramuses" who were "opposed to science." This dogmatic tone has characterized many American scientists and theologians *usque ad nauseam.* It began to grow tiresome. It was a perfect din of assertion and objurgation. There was actual danger of the American people going off into mob hysteria, so violent and cocksure were the asseverations of the partisans of evolution.

Then came Bateson with a modest mien, an honest tone, a much less dogmatic and arrogant manner. He told the assembled scientists just what many of us knew all along—that their assumptions were not warranted and that their proposition was far from being empirically verified. Therefore a more modest air on the part of many scientists would be more becoming, he estimated. This gave the American people a "much-needed rest," and was decidedly refreshing. It showed that the would-be scientists did not "know it all."

The natural reaction of the opponents of evolution, who for some years had been called so many hard names, was to make the most of Dr. Bateson's honest confession. They believed he was sincere and spoke the truth.

If after he had made his humble and damaging admissions, he was so *naive* as still to cling to evolution "by faith," that was his own affair; but the opponents could see clearly that, if so much obscurity and uncertainty hung about the *crux* of the whole matter, viz., the origin of species, the doctrine of evolution was far from being demonstrated scientifically, and the dogmatists had overreached themselves and were humbled to the dust. That this is true is evident from the excitement Dr. Bateson's address stirred among the devotees of evolution.

The psychological riddle about the whole matter is that Dr. Bateson does not seem to realize the fatally undermining character of his admissions. Let us state it: If scientists know so little about the genesis of species, and have not even produced a single clear case of the merging of one species into another by natural processes, then why do they continue to assert that evolution is true? Why does not their dogmatism cease, and also their scorn of people who question their unproved speculations? Why do they not frankly admit that their theory is still in the hypothetical state?

It seems to us, too, that all of them ought to have acumen to see that a scientific theory cannot be proven "by faith." Simply to believe that man has descended from a primate stock certainly does not and cannot establish that view as a fact. Science is not verified by faith. The scientists ought to be logical enough to grasp that point.

It is true that faith in Christ results in certitude, because Christ is a living person and responds to the prayer of faith, giving an experience that converts faith into knowledge and certitude; but faith in a mere scientific theory does not bring such assurance of truth. Try it on any hypothesis and see. Does the scientist receive a direct assurance that his theory is true through faith and prayer? If so, when has such a miracle ever occurred? Voliva believes that the earth is flat; does his faith make it so? Aristotle believed in the old Ptolemaic theory of the solar system; did his faith prove the theory to be correct? Faith may lead a scientist to try out a theory to see whether it is true or not, but faith itself, in the absence of demonstration, cannot make it true.—*L. S. K.*

Was it a Frank Report?

WE have received and read the report of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, in reply to certain criticisms regarding the theological teaching of some of the foreign missionaries of the denomination. At the same time we have also read with much interest Dr. John Roach Straton's analysis as it was printed in *The Watchman-Examiner*. The impression made upon our mind by this reading is this: While the Board of Managers' report was very smoothly and graciously written, it was not full and frank. An effort was made along two lines, whether consciously or unconsciously: First, to try to make the church believe that there were no serious departures among the missionaries from the evangelical faith and the Baptist standards; second, to minimize such departures, if there were any, as of no grave importance.

That there have been serious deflections from the true faith of the gospel, especially among the teachers in the Baptist schools, is shown clearly by many concrete examples in Dr. Straton's article, which lies before us. He gives actual quotations, and they are of a very grave character. Some of the men really seem to rejoice over the fact that modernism has gained so much ground on the foreign field. In some cases they even sought to suppress the expression of conservative views, and tried to keep evangelical men out of their counsels lest they should create disturbance; which meant that they might oppose the teaching of the liberalistic theology. Some of the leaders on the foreign field opposed the Bible Union, which has been organized specifically to defend the Bible and the Christian system from the insidious undermining processes of the liberalists. At least one prominent member of the Foreign Board opposed the Bible Union.

Then there is the disposition on the part of the Board of Managers to minimize the gravity of the situation; just as if it made little difference whether the missionaries teach the heathen the plenary faith of the Gospel or a gospel shredded by rationalism! Surely a missionary Board ought to know that only the full-toned gospel, as it has been revealed in the whole Bible, will bring the heathen to a knowledge of true salvation.

Moreover, there was not perfect frankness in the aforesaid report because it was not prepared by an impartial committee outside of the Board, as was requested by those who made the complaints about liberalistic teaching, but by a committee within the Board itself. That is, the body that has been criticised for permitting modernistic teaching in the foreign field constituted themselves the lawyer, the judge and the jury. Why did they not permit an outside committee to prepare the report according to the findings? We desire to call in question no one's motives; yet as a pure outsider, having read both sides of the dispute, it does not seem to us that the Foreign Board has dealt with the situation with perfect candor. The impression made on our mind is that leading members of the Board are in sympathy with modernistic teaching, and yet, in face of the criticisms passed upon them, they do not have the courage plainly to say so. Thus they evade and cover up the issue. In order to set themselves right with the loyal members of the great Baptist Church, they need to do only one thing—come out frankly against the modernistic tenets and declare themselves firm adherents of the plenary faith and upholders of the standards of their denomination. To our way of thinking, it is all very simple—pursue the honest, frank, straight-forward pathway. Do not dodge; do not use ambiguous language; say just what you mean in simple terms, and mean just what you say.

Thus we cannot blame Dr. Straton and his fellow-fundamentalist for being dissatisfied with the declarations of the Foreign Missionary Society. Those declarations do not seem to ring absolutely true and clear.

The Testimony of Dr. Briggs

AWAY back in 1906 Dr. Charles A. Briggs was known as a liberal Biblical critic, although he had then grown much more conservative than he was at the time of his trial for heresy and when he was writing some of his earlier books. His testimony to and argument for the virgin birth of Christ as published in *The North American Review* in 1906 are worth considering by Dr. Fosdick and his school, who are today casting doubt upon that precious doctrine. We find the quotations we shall give in Dr. C. E. Macartney's valuable recent book, "Twelve Questions About Christ." Here is the first from Dr. Briggs' own pen:

"The philosophical difficulties which beset the doctrine of the virgin birth do not concern the virgin birth in particular, but the incarnation in general. Indeed, the doctrine of the virgin birth seems to be the only way of overcoming the chief difficulties. If the pre-existent Son of God became incarnate by ordinary generation, we could not escape the conclusion that a human individual person was begotten. The incarnation would then not be a real incarnation, but an inhabitation of Jesus by the Son of God, with two distinct personalities, that of the pre-existent Son of God and that of the begotten son of Joseph.

"The man Jesus would be a prophet, a hero, a great example, but not the Saviour of mankind. He might be the last and greatest of the heroes of faith, but not God incarnate. Only a God-man who had taken human nature into organic union with Himself and so identified Himself with the human race as to become the coming man, the second Adam, the Head of the race, could redeem the race. The doctrine of the virgin birth gives such a God-man. Natural generation could not possibly give us such a God-man. Therefore, the doctrine of the virgin birth is essential to the integrity of the incarnation, as the incarnation is to the doctrine of Christ and Christian salvation."

Dr. Briggs says further regarding the virgin birth: "For it is a dogma which is inextricably involved in the Christological principle that lies at the basis of Christian dogma and Christian institutions. They cannot possibly recognize that the birth of Christ was by ordinary human generation, for that would be a revival of the Nestorian heresy and be a denial of the Christian philosophy of the centuries, with all the serious consequences therein involved. It would turn back the dial of Christianity nearly two thousand years; it would break with historical Christianity and its apostolic foundation, and imperil Christianity itself."

Several remarks are apposite in connection with Dr. Briggs' true and acute analysis. Did not the modernists, like Fosdic, Grant, Merrill, Lynch, *et al,* read what Dr. Briggs said so well many years ago. Why do they not read more widely and think more deeply?

Dr. Frederick Lynch, editor of *The Chris-*

tian Work, recently declared that he was not interested in the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ; with him the chief concern was the fact of the divine incarnation. We call his attention to Dr. Briggs' profound presentation, showing that a divine incarnation is impossible without the virgin birth, and that a birth merely by human procreation would bring into the world only a human person, and not a divine person ensphered (or incarnated) in human nature. It is absurd to speak of the God-man if Jesus was a human person with whom the Son of God simply united Himself mystically. Will Drs. Fosdick and Lynch now take heed, and think the matter through?

We call attention to the fact that the present modernist contentions regarding the miraculous conception of Christ is only a recrudescence of an ancient heresy, that of Nestorius, as Dr. Briggs so truly said. The old Nestorian heresy so divided the natures of Christ as to make Him practically two persons, the one human and the other divine. On the other hand, the Monophysite heresy mingled and merged the two natures of our Lord in the way of consubstantiation. There is very little that is new fundamentally in the tenets of modernism. You can trace almost every modern heresy to some gnarled and decayed roots in the olden departures and apostasies from the apostolic faith.

A Characteristic of the New Paganism

IT seems clear to many that we are witnessing a recrudescence of paganism, that in many quarters Christian thoughts and ideals and aspirations are being supplanted by pagan thoughts and ideals and aspirations. There is this striking difference, however, between the new and the old paganism—in the new paganism visible idols are lacking. No doubt even today, in great centers like New York, we occasionally read of pagan chapels in which visible idols are worshipped, but these are exceptional. For the most part, one of the most striking characteristics of ancient paganism, viz., the worship of visible idols, is wholly lacking in the new paganism. And because this characteristic is lacking, many fail to realize that we are living in the midst of a revived paganism.

Whereas the old paganism had its personal objects of worship, such as Baal and Jupiter and Diana, the new paganism centers around impersonal objects, such as art and humanity and money, or else vague ideals. As a result the new paganism is more difficult to combat than the old. Then the prophet could call upon men to choose between Jehovah and Baal, or the apostles could summon men to choose between Christ and Diana. But to-day, the issue is not so clear-cut, because of the impersonal character of the new paganism. The new paganism is strong on ideals and principles, and often these ideals and principles are hardly distinguishable from those that Christ himself taught and exemplified. The new paganism may be devoted to great ideas, to lofty ideals and principles; it may grow eloquent in speaking about love and mercy and peace and the higher life; but it relegates the living, personal God to the background, and knows nothing of allegiance to the living, personal Christ, the image of the invisible God.

In contrast to the new paganism, with its emphasis on principles and ideals, but its denial, or at least non-recognition of the living, personal God, Christianity to-day, as truly as in the first century, places Christ himself in the foreground and relegates ideals and principles to the background. This does not imply any indifference to or minimized estimate of the value of ideals and principles; but it does mean that the power and vitality of the Christian religion lie—not so much in its principles and ideals, as in the Person it enthrones at its center. Where Jesus himself is forgotten or ignored, even though his principles and ideals are retained and praised, Christianity does not exist. Only recently we read an article in a popular magazine in which a popular writer tells why he is a Christian; and yet before he concludes, he tells us that his Christianity is independent even of the question whether Jesus ever lived. It is a sad fact that many to-day apparently think they are Christians merely because they more or less fully accept the ideals and principles associated with the name of Jesus. But surely a Christian that even entertains the thought that it can get along without Jesus himself as a present object of love and worship, is just no Christian at all. Christianity, like ancient paganism, is personal. In proportion as this personal element is relegated to the background, the Christian life languishes and heroic faith is lacking; but in proportion as it is

laced in the foreground, the Christian life lourishes and zeal and enthusiasm in Chris-ian service are evident.

This element of personality is fundamental n Christianity, and one of the distinguishing differences between it and the new paganism of which we write. There was little danger of the early Christians neglecting this element because they lived among those who also emphasized this element—the gods of the heathen were also personal gods. But we, living in an age that exalts ideals and principles rather than persons, need to be on our guard lest we content ourselves with the beautiful ideas that Christ taught and exemplified, and forget him as our personal Lord and Saviour. This difference, we repeat, is vital and fundamental. As one puts it: "Christianity relegates ideas and ideals to the background. And in the foreground, in clear and transparent light, stands the Christ, the incarnated Word. All the enthusiasm with which Christianity was carried into the world sprang from its heaven-wide difference. The philosophers of Greece and Rome doted on beautiful ideals. The apostles were enthused with love for the living Christ, the tangible image of the living God. The secret of their power lay in this personal attachment of faith to the living Christ in very person. It was a heart-to-heart love that conquered the world in that early age. Love, and attachment to the Mediator between God and man, worked the downfall of ancient paganism. When St. Thomas puts his hand on the wound-prints in Jesus' side, sinks to his knees and exclaims, 'My Lord and My God,' all the power of personal worship in God in Christ reveals itself. And by this alone the church of Christ has become what it is."

Wherever the center of interest is shifted from the historic Christ to certain principles or ideals of which he is nothing more than the symbol, we are in the presence of the new paganism rather than Christianity. And yet in much of the Christianity so-called of the present day, it is the ideals and principles connected with the name of Christ rather than Christ himself that stands in the foreground. —*D. S. K.*

Reading the Bible

ONE of the darkest omens of to-day for the church is the failure to read the Bible daily on the part of those who profess to be Christians. The serious succession is this: we cannot know God unless we know Christ. He alone has declared the Father. We cannot know Christ unless we read and know the Scriptures. He said, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." We cannot learn Christ from nature; he is supernatural. We cannot learn him from history, for history only records his existence. The only source of information concerning him is the Scriptures, and he appears there, beginning with the first chapters, and going clear through to the last passage. The Berean Christians were called the more noble, because they searched the Scriptures daily to see if these things be true. All the study about the Bible and all the study at the hands of others cannot be compared with a diligent personal and daily reading and study of it for one's self. No doubt, many Christians, especially young Christians to-day, are uncomfortable and lonely, because they do not know Christ, in that source where only he can be known.—*D. S. K.*

Read these Kind Words—May I say that I became a subscriber the first year *Bible Student and Teacher* was published, and have continued a subscriber ever since. And I'm not only a subscriber, but I also read it, and that virtually from beginning to end. It has always been a good magazine, but it never was better than the CHAMPION is today! (Thanks!) Every minister of the Gospel, whatever his leaning may be, should read the CHAMPION. With the over-much published on "the other side," one cannot afford to neglect "this side," if he wishes to keep fully posted. But I am heart and soul with the CHAMPION in its fight. Many of the articles printed are worth more than the price of the subscription for a year. May the Lord graciously continue to inspire the editors in their noble work, and may He bless you in publishing the CHAMPION.—*Rev. H. J. Pietenpol.*

"Quit You like Men, be strong"

THE Apostle Paul, in the closing exhortation of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, charges them in this way: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong." This was a quotation from the language of the Philistines when they learned that the Ark of the Lord had come into the camp. They were frightened, and their leaders charged them to "Be strong and quit yourselves like men. O ye Philistines, that ye be not servants unto the Hebrews as they have been to you; quit yourselves like men and fight." Both Paul and the Philistines call for strong men, but Paul's means of securing this manhood is very different from that of the Philistines. They appeal to utility and self-interest. Paul appeals to faith in God and the love of God.

This cry for strong men has been persistent in all ages, both by the pagan world and the Christian church, and the difference in means of securing the manhood has remained the same. In modern times, the contrast and conflict is between Christianity and revived cultured paganism. Both call for strong men. Christianity appeals to faith and the love of God as revealed in the Scriptures. Paganism appeals to natural development and evolution through nature's struggle.

A comparison between the men who have been made strong through the Bible and those who seek their strength from merely natural sources is all in favor of the Bible-made men. Christianity has no place for pusillanimity nor churlishness. Its faith and love of God make the heart bigger, courage stronger, hope brighter, affections purer, and sympathies intenser and wider. It makes bigger, stronger men in every way.

On the other hand, paganism's appeal to the natural defiles every faculty and power of man. The fellowship with and knowledge of God develops humility in the soul. But the self-exaltation of man, pressed by paganism, develops corroding pride.

Moreover, history shows that Christianity and the Bible has developed the intellect of man as well as the heart. The Bible, which is Christianity's text-book, excels all other documents extant or extinct in all that expands and exalts the soul. Those who study it most have become mighty, not only in character, but in word and deed.

Look at Milton. Take from him the language and imagery of the Bible, and you have shorn him of strength and glory. Rob Shakespeare of his Biblical conception and principles, and his great dramas sink to the level of cheap dialogues.

Burke read the Bible morning, noon, and night. His biographer makes special mention of it. He was among the broadest of men, remarkable in comprehension, clear and wide in vision. It gave him concise, clear diction of wonderful imagery.

Newton, the great physicist, the discoverer of gravitation, was a diligent student of the Bible. In his commentary on the Book of Daniel, he remarks that before the fulfilment of the prophecy, the modes of travel would be so improved that men would be able to go fifty miles an hour. Voltaire, on reading this passage, ridiculed the idea of fifty miles an hour, and said that the mighty mind of "The poor old dotard"! But the prophecies of Daniel are not yet all fulfilled, and we have lived to see men go at 250 miles an hour.

Compare Webster with the Mormon leader, Washington and Lincoln with Tom Paine and Bob Ingersoll, Gladstone with the deists and materialists, and no one will question that strength and manhood are in favor of the men of Bible study, men of faith and love of God, over against men who depended alone upon natural development, inherent strength, circumstances, and utilitarian motives.

The elements of Biblical manhood are: Love and loyalty to God, integrity towards man, and fidelity to self. Love and loyalty to God is the lodestone that gives to human pursuits their proper direction—a heavenward tendency. As the principle of action, it is the grand governor in the machinery of a man's motives and efforts. It lifts man vertically, while all the results of man by science and civilization bring only horizontal change. "Any crown reached in the face of God will be but a burning circlet. A throne or a presidential chair attained by violation of the laws of God will be a restless seat." As all the bodies of the solar system are suspended in space and kept in their order by no power save the omnipotent, invisible attraction of the center, so, too, the souls of men are sustained, preserved and glorified through the attracting power of faith and the love of God. "Seek first the kingdom of God," is Christ's precept, and "All things shall be added unto you," is his promise.

The sum of the moral law as stated by Christ is love to God and love to man. Deviating from this standard, despite all natural and evolutionary influence, down the scale go human souls until they land in drunkenness and debauchery and live with the beasts; yea, we sink in torment and degradation of devils. But while the moral law enjoins duties toward God and neighbor, it no less enjoins duty to self. Christ's epitome of the Ten Commandments makes self-love the standard of our philanthropy. The law requires no man to love his neighbor, whether Jew or Samaritan, more than himself. To defend one's person and one's reputation and maintain one's just and God-given rights, is only to obey a purified instinct and the divine law. He who does less is a suicide. The modernist, with his new thought, opposes all this. He is exhuming the skeletons of a decayed paganism and using them to divert men from the Bible as the infallible Word of God. If their schemes succeed, manhood is lost, and we sink in defeat and degradation.—*D. S. K.*

Christ's Birth

THERE is something appropriate in celebrating the birth of our Lord in the darkest season of the year. He came into the world in the darkest night of its history, when the blackness of sin was everywhere, when men groaned under oppression, and when despair had settled down upon the earth like a great pall. Into this night Christ came as the morning sun, with hope and healing in his wings.

The practices now associated with Christmas have largely lost sight of all this. The fret and rush to purchase and present costly gifts, the planning for great feasts and hilarity, have done much to relegate the real significance of the day into the background, if not to put it out of sight and mind. We would not discourage the expression of joy and good-will and proper pleasure in this celebration, but this has been carried so far, and has become in many cases so divorced from the meaning of the event, that even the services in some of the churches degrade the occasion and its observation.

It is timely, therefore, to call attention to the real significance of this occasion and festival. It all centers in the birth of Christ, and the meaning of his birth is determined by his person, his mission and his message.

First of all, we need to know and appreciate the person of Christ. The failure to know Christ's person has been at the root of all unbelief, variance and contention in the church and among men through the ages. It is the center of the present portentous controversy in the modern church and whole modern civilization. Who was this person whose birth brought wise men from long distances to render homage and present offerings? Who was this one whose birth was heralded by a multitude of angels? They brought the glad tidings that this one was "born a Saviour who is Christ the Lord," and sang with heavenly music, "Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth, good-will toward men." Who is this person whose birth caused the plain men, the shepherds, to leave their flocks, and go to the Bethlehem manger, and when they had seen the newborn child to return, "glorifying and praising God for all things they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them"? Was this simply an ordinary child, only one of the human race, the son of Joseph and Mary? If so, why all this special demonstration, and why should a star appear to mark the place where he was born? Why all this heavenly demonstration over one so lowly and regarded so insignificant on earth as to be born in a manger? The modernist sweeps all this aside and maintains the mere naturalistic conclusion that this person was only an ordinary person, the child of a poor carpenter and a plain, obscure woman. And from this child of common humanity came all this power, all the progress, and all blessing that is included in the centuries of Christianity. Can this be true? If so, then Christianity is a mere human thing; it has risen, proceeded, and must fall and pass away like all else that is merely natural and human. Before we yield to this fearful significance, let us go to the manger and the child and the record and see if there is not some better thing provided for us. The chief record of his birth, and of these attending facts of the angels, and the wise men, and the shepherds, is found in the books of Matthew and Luke. These two exclusive witnesses to the birth of Jesus also declare that he was not an ordinary person. Joseph was not his father. He was conceived by "the power of the Holy Ghost," and "he shall be called the Son of God," "the Son of the

Highest." His name is "Jesus," Saviour, and "He shall save his people from their sins." While John has nothing to say about the event of the birth, he has much to say about the Person and his Father. Of the Person, he declares that when all other things began to be, he already was; that he "was with God," and that "he was God." "All things were made by him," that he was the "true Light." He was born, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory as the glory of *the only begotten of the Father,* full of grace and truth." Paul covers the whole case when he says: "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Putting all this testimony together, two conclusions are evident: (1) The Birth of Jesus which we celebrate at Christmas was not the birth of an ordinary human being with a human father. It was the birth into this world of the only begotten Son of God, and God only is his Father. (2) If we deny this, we deny the testimony of the only witnesses in the cases, and thereby deny the very birth and historicity of Jesus.

Again, the mission and the message of Jesus can be accounted for only by the fact that he is God, and the only begotten Son of God, who came into this world by the birth of a virgin. The mission of Christ, according to the whole record, was first to declare and reveal God in his own person directly to man. So that in his own human nature man may see and know God, and not be left to human wisdom or human words. So we are told that "No man hath seen God at any time, neither indeed can he know him." But the Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. "In the wisdom of God man by wisdom knew not God." Christ says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The second part of Christ's mission was to conquer man's enemies, sin, Satan and death. Satan was conquered in the Wilderness, sin on the cross, and death, the last enemy, in the resurrection.—*D. S. K.*

Bible Study

OF course, we want to know the outside facts about the Book, such as its authorship and chronology and historical setting. "Experts" are continually engaged in discussing these things. For all just criticisms, "higher" or "lower," we should be sincerely thankful. Let the critics go on kindling fires under the Bible and pouring corrosive acids upon it; the result can only be to establish more firmly its trustworthiness as the Word of God.

We must be careful, however, to estimate aright the relative value of these external considerations and the life giving truths contained in the Book. We cannot postpone our quest of life until the critics shall have settled their mutual controversies, but must needs open the volume and determine for ourselves what God there reveals to us. For this we have the search warrant of our Lord and no caveat can restrain us. He said "Search the Scriptures;" and we are bound to search them, because therein is the secret of life.

Our zest is like that of Ponce de Leon when he set out to find the fountain of youth. He was fifty-two years of age; his hair was turning gray and the chill of increasing years was in his blood; wherefore it was vain to dissuade him. In answer to all objections he could only say, "It may be, as you insist, a fool's errand; but if there be, in some far distant land, a fountain that can restore the wasted energies of life I must make haste to go and drink of it!"

So from all questions of minor import as to authorship and redactorship and from hair-splitting controversies about inspiration and revelation we turn to the Book itself and, throwing it open, turn our attention to its inside facts.

What have we here? At the outset we come upon this statement: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

If "all scripture is profitable" then, of course, there is nothing either false or superfluous in it. Let there be no misunderstanding at this point; the Bible was not intended to be a mere manual for public reading in the sanctuary or at the public altar or anywhere else; it was intended to be a universal rule of faith and practice; and, to that end, it must touch the whole circumference of human life at every point. Of all the literature of the ages it is the only book that does it.

But while everything here is "profitable," for one use or another, it is obvious that some truths and precepts are more profitable than others, and therefore more worthy of emphasis. A farmer in traversing his fields may put a less or greater estimate on a boulder or an oak-opening or a stretch of meadow here or there, but there are four stones at the corners of his farm which are of immeasurable value because they establish the tenure of his possession. The four "land marks" of scriptural truth, which must be regarded as far and away the most important of its inside facts, are these: God, Christ, the Cross and Justification by Faith.

It is clearly more profitable to know about God than it is to spend one's time and energy in solving the query "Where did Cain get his wife?" It is more profitable to know about Christ as the incarnate Son than to inquire where Melchizedek came from or went to. It is more profitable to understand about the vicarious atonement which was wrought on Calvary than it is to wander about, like Milton's lost angels, in the mazes of "fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute." And it is more profitable to solve the question of our personal salvation in pursuance of the great doctrine of Justification by Faith than to tarry among the minute details of typology and symbolism.—*D. J. B.*

Modernism a Fashion

ONE of two influences governs every man. These are fashion and principle. Principle is permanent, constant, eternal. Fashion changes. The mind that is not governed by principles wearies of a constant order. It calls for a change. This is seen in the manner of buildings being erected. The classical architectures are developed on principle. The other forms are matters of style and fashion. They are appreciated for a season, because everybody is having them. But because they lack principle they fade away, and we return to those developed on principle. How many dwellings, churches and public buildings were building in America thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, because they were the fashion? How ugly and unsatisfactory they have become, and what a return there is to the classic forms!

Just now there is a great deal of talk about modernism in religion—modern man and modern gospel, and modern church. This is just a wave of fashion. Man is ever the same, a rational physical being, mortal and moral, a soul a body. He is a sinner now, and always has been. The gospel is the same. It came from heaven, and is everlasting. We might as well talk about modern air, modern sunshine, modern water and dew, modern fire, as to talk about a modern man or a modern gospel. Some incidents and forms change, but they are not the man, nor have they anything to do with salvation. One becomes weary of the whole transient, superficial tone of modernism. God is from everlasting to everlasting. Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Man is always man. The only distinction is some are saved and some are lost. Why, then, trifle with fads and fashions?—*D. S. K.*

An Appreciation—You have certainly wonderfully improved the BIBLE CHAMPION within the last year or more. And, considering the volume and diversity of the religious matter it contains, and the scholarship, literary finish, and logic displayed in the articles which appear in the different departments—Editorial, Notes and Comments, Arena, and the several other departments of the CHAMPION, not to mention the fine review of books and other literary publications—it is my estimate that the CHAMPION has few equals in this country as a religious magazine, and certainly *none* for the price. One who loves the truth as it is in Jesus, and earnestly desires to see that truth ably proclaimed and defended in these perilous times, can not be guiltless if he knows of the CHAMPION and does not have a copy of it in his home, or fails to give it his generous and hearty support.

Notes and Comments

IN a local paper ex-Senator Thomas Robinson, a former patron of this magazine and a valued contributor, has an article answering the question "What Is Fundamentalism and What Is Modernism?" He is a lawyer of large experience and wide reading. For incisiveness, penetration, discriminating vision, he ranks well up with the late Judge Lamb, whose contributions always informed and delighted our readers. In referring to Peter's divinely revealed fundamental answer to Christ's question, "Whom say ye that I am?" (Matt. xvi. 15), he makes the discrimination that Peter does not say *a* son of God, but *the* Son of God, as the foundation on which Christ will build His Church; and the Senator finely adds: "Any Protestant denomination which holds and teaches that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and Mary, while its members may be good and ethical people, are not entitled to be called a Christian Church, for they do not recognize or admit the fact upon which He said He would build His Church." Unitarians, please take notice. But why does not this apply as inexorably to individuals as to denominations? And do not those who deny the Virgin Birth thus unmistakably classify themselves?

Our contributing editor, Rev. Dr. W. B. Riley, had the pleasure of beginning on January 6 a week's dedication services of his new church, the First Baptist church of Minneapolis, Minn. On March 1 he had been pastor of this church twenty-seven years. When he went to it, it had a membership of 662; now it has 2,642, and 50 more awaiting admission. It had a church property valued at $100,000; now it stands at $1,000,000, and it is said to be one of the finest and best adapted church plants in America. Its spacious and beautiful auditorium is well-nigh perfect. In a sense connected with this church, is the Northwestern Bible Training School which is doing a wonderful work and of which Dr. Riley is president. As a conductor of Bible Conferences and as an evangelist he is in constant demand. The World Fundamentals Association will hold its sixth annual conference in this building June 8-15. Dr. Riley has not only our congratulations, but the congratulations of the whole BIBLE CHAMPION family.

An acute correspondent of the New York *World* puts the following pertinent question to an advocate of the current pseudo-scientific theory: "If the human race evolved through countless gradations upward from one low form of life, why do we have any definitely defined species in either the animal or vegetable world? Should we not have a long line of easy gradations, one form slipping into the next higher, with no distinct species at all, unless each individual was denoted as a species unto itself? When the break-up into species came about, what became of the intermediates, and why?" Just so! How will the evolutionist get out of this cul-de-sac?

Against the materialistic and mechanistic theories of the day, we would reply: To assume that there is a personal, all powerful God back of and in the universe is not illogical or unphilosophical. The fact is, we must assume some kind of an ultimate power that is competent and eternal. What other Power than God will meet the exigency? Surely impersonal matter is not adequate to account for the cosmos. A mere piece of dead mechanism could not produce life, personality and thought. The very exigencies of reason lead inevitably to the theistic world-view.

If the cosmogony of the Bible is not correct, why was it inserted in the Bible? Why did the writer describe so many particulars in the process of bringing the world to its present form, if he did not intend his narrative to be believed? Or, to give a still keener edge to the question, if God inspired the writer of Genesis I and II, would He have led him to write so detailed a story if it was not true to the facts? Would God cause a false version of the process of creation to be told? A recent writer who leans somewhat toward liberalistic views intimates that we need to accept only the following items in the Biblical account of the creation: 1. There is a personal God; 2. He is distinct from His creation; 3. Creation was successive and progressive. Then why did not God say that much and stop? Why did He cause confusion by adding a detailed cosmogony? These are salient questions. The modernists should answer them.

Note what the Psalmist says about *his* Bible: "Thy Word is a lamp to my feet and light unto my pathway." How much of the

Bible did he have at that time? Perhaps the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and part of the books of Samuel; possibly also the books of Job and Ruth. If he could say so much for *his* Bible, meager as it was, how much more can we say of *our* Bible, which includes the full revelation of God's redeeming grace in Jesus Christ!

Still another writer in the New York *World* is wasting his ammunition. He accuses anti-evolutionists of gloating over the fact that "Darwinism is dead," and thus thinking that evolution is dead. No well posted man makes any such claim. Every one ought to know that the evolutionists today reject Darwin's method of explaining evolution, but that they still cling to the hypothesis itself, and try to explain it in some other way. The significance of the change from Darwin's explanation and the several explanations more or less current today is the protean form of scientific theorizing. Once—back in the eighties and nineties—the Darwinian ideas were all the vogue among the propagandists of evolution; but, presto! their theories have been greatly altered. Therefore science is far from *semper idem*. If religious people have had to change their views several times in history, the scientists have had to change theirs times innumerable.

It is interesting—sometimes amusing, too—to read after Ransome Sutton in the New York *World*. He conducts a department under the caption, "Fireside Science." He does not, however, stay in the pure realm of science, but makes frequent excursions into the realm of speculation. Yet he seems to think whatever he asserts is real science. Recently some human fossils were found in Santa Barbara, California, which some "scientists" have declared to be more simian than human; *ergo,* the human race got its start, not in central Asia, not in the Gobi desert of China, but right here in our own America. Mr. Sutton opposes this latest theory with might and main. And what is his strongest argument? That America is an apeless continent| Apes have never existed in this country; *ergo,* the human family could not have begun its career in America, because there were no ape from which it could have sprung. You must go to apeland to find man's natal place. Either that, or we must fall back on creation, says Mr. Sutton. But to fall back on divine creation would not be "progressive!" It is so much more progressive and uplooking to fall back on ape-ology!

The difficulty today is not that many people are unwilling to accept new truth. All intelligent Christians are willing to accept any truth that has been clearly established. It is part of the Christian spirit to be open to truth wherever it may be found. Christ declared that the truth will make men free. No; the trouble today is that so many would-be leaders of thought want to reject old, well-tried and well-established truth, and truth, too, that is foundational in the Christian system. This effort on the part of the self-styled modernists is what constitutes the divisive factor in the Christian church. It is a negative element; destructive, not constructive; therefore fruitful of division and strife.

It is credibly reported that a certain minister said not long ago in a public discourse that, if Christ had died in the garden of Gethsemane and had gone to heaven, the blood that He sweat there would have made atonement for the sins of the world. Why do some men want to say erratic things? It is this modern *furor* for saying "smart" things, under the impression that they are original, that causes disputation in the Christian Church; for almost always the smart epigram-maker tries to say something that will cause a sensation because it is contrary to the Word of God. The sensationalist likes the spirit of "dare." But what is wrong about this minister's declaration? It is diametrically opposed to the Scriptures. Jesus Himself said (Luke 24:26): "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." How could Christ have risen from the dead if He had not died? The letter to the Hebrews says that Christ "by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Paul says that God's love is shown in that Christ *died* for the ungodly. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." Jesus is called "the Lamb slain from the foundations of the world." If the wages of sin are death, as the Scriptures teach, then the Redeemer must have suffered death in order to be man's proper substitute. It is so much better to say the truth as it is in Christ than to try to say "smart" things.

To divide the church of Christ over mere "forms of expression" is sinful indeed. If the old forms express the truths which we believe and ought to believe, why should we find fault with them? Of course, there is no

harm in trying to express the old truth in modern language, providing we do not modify or emasculate the truth itself. However, as a rule, the modernist wants to change the truth in some way, while pretending to modernize only the literary form. Again, it is wrong to divide the church on account of the so-called "forms of modern thought." Mere *forms* of thought do not amount to a great deal; it is the truth itself that counts. Human thought is good enough in its place, and there is no doubt that God wants men to use their intellectual powers; but it has always proved itself exceedingly fallible, and has often needed either reversal or revision. Therefore we do not think it would be advisable to make human thought, whether past or present, or "the forms of thought," a substitute for the inerrant divine thought and forms of thought that God has given us in His holy Word. It so often happens that "the wisdom of men is foolishness with God."

Here is a unique overture. The editor of a liberalistic paper assures the world that all the modernists ask of the fundamentalists is that both of them agree to "accept the Christianity of Jesus as it is expressed in the best authenticated words of Jesus." A man must be blind to the vital issues of the day who can make such a proposition, and who thinks that the two parties can come together upon it. What are "the best authenticated words of Jesus?" The Fundamentalists say that they are all the words attributed to Jesus in the New Testament. Will the modernists agree to that? If they will, the dispute is ended, and all will be calm and sunshine in the churches. But you know they have a very different conception of the words of our Lord. According to the modernists, the "best authenticated words of Jesus" are only those in which He teaches "love to God and love to man." Is that all that Jesus taught? No! He taught a thousand things besides, and they are just as well authenticated as the words quoted. Evangelical Christians can never assent to human reason picking and choosing just what it wants to believe in the Holy Scriptures.

A brilliant speaker, who knows what vital Christianity is, recently said that the living of the best life involves three cardinal principles: "Sin atoned, selfishness dethroned, Christ enthroned." Well and truly said.

Christian people must be on their guard against a favorite but misleading slogan of the modernists. The latter have much to say about "the religion of Jesus." However, they do not mean by that phrase what evangelical Christians mean and have always meant—the religion which Jesus came from heaven to give the world and which makes Him the object of faith and worship; the religion which says, "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." No, they do not mean that: by "the religion of Jesus" they mean the religion that Jesus believed and practiced—faith in God and love to man. Jesus was simply the first of a series, the pioneer of the true religious life. He was not the world's Saviour and Redeemer, according to these equivocal purveyors, but only our true teacher and example in the practice of the religious life. So the modernists. But thinking people can see that this is not the religion which Jesus gave to the world.

At this writing Dr. Paul Kammerer, a noted scientist of Vienna, Austria, is in this country, expecting to give a series of lectures on scientific subjects. His friend and translator, Dr. A. Paul Maerker-Branden, organized a committee to receive and honor him. The surprising thing is that many of the foremost biologists of this country declined to serve on the committee, although most of them sent letters courteously explaining why they did so. They said that they were afraid the people might understand such an act as an underwriting of Dr. Kammerer's scientific views. And what was the great and vital difference of opinion that prevented them from serving on the committee? It was only this: Dr. Kammerer holds that acquired characteristics may be inherited, and thinks that he has proved it by his experiments with mollusks and salamanders. The other biologists do not believe this doctrine; therefore they could not serve on the reception committee! It seems to us that was not a "broad" position to take. The point of difference, though it may have some value for speculative science, is of no vital practical importance. Yet some of these scientists, and many others who are not scientists, call us evangelical believers "narrow" if we do not fellowship in public meetings with people of every shade of religious belief, no matter how wide, fundamental and important their differences. Such promiscuous association in religion might also be misunderstood by the public, might it not? Many people might think that evangelical believers either endorse the views of

heretics or else do not think their errors serious. Among true, full-toned believers there are some differences of interpretation of certain parts of the Bible, and yet they do not refuse to associate together in many ways, both public and private. Thus it would appear that evangelical believers are not as "narrow" as many of the very "broad" scientists of our day. Let us think that over too.

It is no wonder that many people get a bad impression of the views and temper of orthodox Christians. People who read only such newspapers as the New York *World* cannot well receive any other impression. At this writing the above-named paper is reporting the meetings of the Baptist Fundamentalists in New York City, and is commenting upon them editorially. No doubt those earnest men said some vigorous things in a vigorous way. They were not a soft, gushy and mushy group of men, nor were they there to shed briny tears over the heretics who are rending the Protestant church in twain. They were manly, full-blooded men who, like Paul, loved all men and desired all men to be saved, and yet who, like Paul again, as well as his Master, called things by their right name, and did not always use "honeyed" speech. Our Lord Himself was gentle and loving, yet he drove the money-changers out of the temple with a good deal of indignation, and called the scribes and Pharisees a "generation of hypocrites." But the *World,* instead of presenting the arguments of the speakers, seized upon every strong expression used in the midst of an argument, and dependent upon the argument for its reason and force, and exaggerated it beyond all truth and reason. If we could get the ear of the editor of the *World* for just a moment, we would say to him very kindly, but very firmly, that evangelical believers are very much in earnest, believing that they are trying to uphold a vital cause; but they are not filled with rancor and hatred—no, not even against the modernists, who are responsible for the present upheaval in the Christian church.

Dr. R. A. Torrey made a statement in the December number of *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* which we cannot refrain from quoting: "The Modernists are making a great deal of the alleged bitterness of the conservatives and the supposed gentleness, kindness and charity of the Modernists themselves. But any one who has kept close watch of the writings on both sides must know that the bitterest and most rancorous words that have been spoken have been spoken by these Modernists." Then he goes on to prove his assertion by concrete examples. We believe it would be much more to the point for the Modernists to give reasons for their views, and reply in a manly way to the arguments of the conservatives, than to complain like hurt children about the somewhat vigorous handling they receive. To provoke a controversy in the church, as they have done, and then whimper when they are opposed and refuted, is neither ethical nor heroic.

We have a question to put to those who deny the biological miracle of Christ's conception in the virgin Mary. The only records we have of Christ's birth and infancy are those of Matthew and Luke. If these accounts are not true, where is there an account of our Lord's birth and childhood? We may guess that he was born of Joseph and Mary, but we are absolutely without any records. Would it not be passing strange that the four evangelists would give detailed accounts in other ways of such a marvellous personage as Jesus Christ, and represent Him as the Messiah of the world, and yet never say one word about His nativity, infancy and childhood? We must challenge the modernists to tell us how Jesus was conceived and born. If they reply that he was naturally engendered, and was the son of Joseph and Mary, then we must ask them to produce the records of the event, so that the world can have certainty about so vital a matter.

Another question occurs in this connection: If Matthew and Luke did not tell the truth about the nativity of Christ, how do we know that they told the truth in anything else they told us about Him? If they falsified or were mistaken, how can we have any assurance that Mark and John were veracious and trustworthy? Do you not see, ye Modernists, that your theories bemist the whole system of Christian truth?

Going back to a previous paragraph, we are moved to say that we do not think the editor of the New York *World* is the proper person to preach to the Fundamentalists about love and gentleness, because few writers have said more stinging and abusive things about the Fundamentalists than he. Again and again he has applied unkind epithets to them. Mr. Bryan has received most insulting scorn at his hands. If preaching on kindness is to be effective, it must come from a better source than the editor of the said journal.

Is it not only a difference of opinion—the present dispute in the Christian church? So some people seem to think. If that were all it meant, we would advise stopping it at once. Human opinions are so unimportant that they are not worth quarreling about, although friends might sometimes have a few minutes of friendly arguments over them. But evangelical Christians are not contending for their mere opinions. The issue is not one of human opinion, no, no; the issue is, What does the Bible teach? The conservatives simply insist on that, not on what they excogitate out of their own brains. It is the modernists who are fighting about opinions, for they set up their own thinking against the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. For our part, we would think it very wicked to disturb the church just to air our own puny opinions. "But is it not a mere matter of opinion to believe that the Bible is God's Word?" some one inquires. Oh, no! with truly regenerated Christians that is a matter of *experience,* not of human intellection.

Another critic—this time it is a woman—writing for *The Christian Work,* of New York, puts the old hymn, "The Faith of our Fathers," into the crucible. Nothing sacred escapes these critics—hyper-critics, one should say. In thinking of "the faith of our fathers," she recalls a few of the erroneous and childish things that some of her forebears believed, and she brings them forward and regales her readers with them. Then she concludes that "the faith of our fathers" must be taken with a good many grains of salt. We wonder whether any of us who have sung the old hymn with so much joy and inspiration ever meant by it to hold to every notion that our fathers ever held. That is not at all what is meant. The thing that is meant is the old faith in Christ as our only Saviour and Substitute and the Bible through and through as the Word of God, on which we can thoroughly rely. We mean a solid faith, not the tottering, wavering, wind-tossed faith of men who hold one thing today and something very different tomorrow. We mean "a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by many a foe."

An infidel paper that sometimes comes to our desk contains an article on the subject, "Why I Don't Like Jesus." We are sorry the writer feels as he does toward our Lord. When Christian believers remember how much Christ has done for them, how much He is to them in all the experiences of life, it hurts them deeply to read such articles as the one to which we refer. Their hope and prayer are that the unbeliever may some time come to Christ and discover how good and gracious He is. Once some of us had an estranged feeling toward Him, too, but when we became better acquainted with Him, and found out who He really was, we found that He was "the Friend of sinners;" "the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother."

Some months ago Rev. John Kelman, D.D., went on record as saying that he could not accept the doctrines which the Presbyterian Assembly declared to be "essential." He said that he would not have accepted a call to the Presbyterian church he has been serving in New York, if he had thought any such restrictions were imposed upon him. Now let it be remembered that all the doctrines referred to are clearly taught in the Bible, such as the deity of Christ, the virgin birth and His second coming. A recent number of *The Christian Work* contains one of the strongest eulogies on "the Word of the Lord" (meaning the Bible) that we have ever read. It was written by Rev. John Kelman, D.D., of New York. Of course, there is nothing new in what he says; it all has been said again and again by evangelical scholars; but it is put in Dr. Kelman's own way, and makes excellent and uplifting reading. There is not in it a hint of cutting out any part of the Bible. The panegeric sounds as if the author were one of the most orthodox men in the world. Now we are puzzled to correlate the position of the writer on December 8th with the position he took a few short months before. Oh, that all lovers of the Bible would walk in the straight road of logical consistency! If all the liberalists would have taken the position respecting the Bible that Dr. Kelman has taken in his lately printed convictions, they would not be liberalists, and there would be no controversy in the Christian church today. Even now, if they would all take that position, and abide by it, the strife would end at once, and the church could go forward unimpeded in her evangelistic and missionary work. Think what an era of good will and progress and soul-winning that would introduce!

The most recent statements we have at this writing from Drs. Alexander and Merrill afford some hope that the proposal of one of our contributors (see the article on "What the Modernists Lack" in this number of the CHAMPION) may be realized, namely, that

the best thing that could occur would be for the modernists to come back to the simple faith of the gospel and experience its uplifting and assuring grace. In spite of the rather vehement protests they made shortly after the meeting of the Presbyterian Assembly at Indianapolis last spring, both of them now assert their belief in the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, and call it "the only infallible rule of faith and practice;" in Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God, who became flesh and dwelt among us; in His virgin birth, His death for our sins, our living Lord and Saviour, the only Head of the church. Several times in their declaration, they say, "according to the Scriptures," as if they accepted their testimony to be final. Dr. Henry Van Dyke has also declared his acceptance of the virgin birth of Christ. All evangelical believers rejoice in these expressions, and hope that these gifted men will exert their influence in bringing others to the same kind of an acknowledgment. We must wait for a time to see whether they will in the future preach and teach consistently with their recent declarations of faith.

According to an analysis by Dr. Stuart L. Tyson in the New York *World* of the difference between the fundamentalists and the modernist, it consists of a conflict between two differing types of mind. The fundamentalist is conservative, and holds tenaciously to old truth, and does not have an open mind for new truth, and is not progressive. He—the fundamentalist—thinks all truth was revealed once for all. On the other hand, the modernist is progressive; he has the open mind; he welcomes every new truth. This is the superficial explanation of a would-be highbrow. But it is wide of the mark, and betokens the sad lack of thorough thinking that usually characterizes the liberalistic school. The fundamentalist does not cling to old truth merely because it is old, but because he is convinced experientially and intellectually that it is true; nor does he reject any new proposition simply because it is new, but because it has not been sufficiently validated. He wants "to be shown." He does not throw away the old and tested simply because it is old, neither does he reject any new thing simply because it is new, but waits for it to "make good." As soon as it does that, he gladly accepts it. On the other hand, the modernist is too much inclined to cast off the old because it is old, and to accept the new because it is new and before it has proved itself to be true.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart L. Tyson displays his lack of profundity and logic when he classes Christ and Paul among the modernists. It is true that Christ repudiated the erroneous traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees; but He accepted the Old Testament, referring to it again and again as ultimate authority. In one or two places He modified it slightly by giving it a wider and more fitting application in the added light that He brought into the world; but for the most part He quoted it as of divine authority, even going back to the first and second chapters of Genesis as the basis of the divine institution of monogamous marriage. Besides, Christ aligned Himself with the evangelicals when He declared that heaven and earth might pass away, but His Word would stand forever. He also declared that not "one jot or tittle of the law" should pass away, till all be fulfilled. As for Paul, he told Timothy to hold on to the "deposit" of truth which he had received. He said that his gospel was divinely revealed to him, and if man or angel from heaven should preach any other gospel, he should be anathema. While he changed some things in procrustean Judaism, because it had misunderstood the purpose of the Old Testament, he everywhere appealed to those Scriptures as final authority and as all "God-breathed" (2 Tim. 3:16). No; Christ and Paul were not modernists; they were fundamentalists.

An evangelical believer cannot have a "static" religion. Why? Because he believes the whole Bible, which bids him "prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good." That means progress and open-mindedness; but it does not mean a weather-vane religion, now blowing this way, now that, now hot, now cold. The same apostle who gave the above injunction warned us against those who depart from the faith and are tossed by every wind of doctrine.

Here is something that is heartening. In spite of the scorn that the modernists have been heaping upon William Jennings Bryan, the publishers of his book, "In His Image," Fleming H. Revell Company, announce the issue of the tenth edition of the book. How many "ignorant" people there must be in this country who are willing to spend their good money for this book by a man who, as a novice recently said, "is utterly ignorant of history and science." This is the announcement that the publishers are making in their advertisement of "In His Image": "The epoch-making book against Darwinism that

is awakening religious leaders, startling educators, influencing legislation!"

Here is an actual incident. Several physicians were making light of the so-called "rib story" of the Bible relative to the forming of woman. They asserted that man does not now-a-days have one less rib on one side than on the other. A Christian physician was in the group, and spoke as follows: "You men perform operations on people, sometimes cutting off their hands or feet or removing their appendices; but the people thus deprived never beget children who are minus those members or organs, do they?" There was silence. The doctor who told the story remarked to a friend afterward: "Some of these would-be wise critics of the Bible do not use their brains enough!" It may be added that the Hebrew word from which the word "rib" is derived (*tzela*) simply means the side; therefore the Biblical sentence might be translated, "And He (God) took one of the man's side-portions," and from this He "made (builded) a woman, and brought her to the man."

One of the most trying modernists is Rev. Stuart L. Tyson, M.A. (Oxon). At this date he is writing a series of articles for some of the New York papers. He has swallowed the theory of evolution whole; likewise the radical Biblical criticism; he takes both of them for granted, even declaring that they are no longer theories, but established facts. No use to examine them any further; they are "closed questions." And yet he declares that the fundamentalists are people with "closed minds," while the modernists are the savants with the "open mind." He asserts, and asserts, and asserts over and over again, but never proves, and never once gives the faintest hint that he has read a good conservative book which shows the unproved case of the rationalizers and iconoclasts. Really, friends, it is not worth while to follow the sinuous and inconsequential meanderings of the Rev. Mr. Tyson.

"Are Our Schools Free" was the subject of a recent discourse before the open forum of Grace Community church in Denver, by Rev. Dr. L. B. Longacre, professor in the Iliff School of Theology (Methodist) in that city. The subject was said to be "timely because of attitude of W. J. Bryan." At an annual meeting of the Colorado M. E. Conference, Professor Longacre and another Iliff professor were entertained in the home of a United Presbyterian elder who is as well posted, biblically and theologically, as many ministers. One night they sat up until two o'clock, not cussing exactly, but discussing theological subjects. Professor Longacre, among other vagrancies, scouted the Virgin Birth. As far as the Person of Christ is concerned, he showed himself to be an out-and-out Unitarian. An Iliff student was sent to supply a church some miles out of Denver. His preaching was so objectionable that the people asked that he be not sent there any more. Oh, yes, Iliff is evidently pretty "free." We once heard a Free Religionist described as a person who was exceedingly free with religion and free of it.

The Rev. John Robertson, D.D.,LL.D., is (or was) a member of the New York Presbytery, but resides in Cincinnati, where he edits a journal for Scotchmen. At the meeting of the Presbytery before the last May General Assembly at Indianapolis, he put up a violent but unavailing effort for the Old Faith. So far gone and so dominant did he find his erring brethren, he threatened to shake the Presbyterian dust off his shoes and go over to the Episcopalians. At the meeting of the Presbytery last December 10 his threat materialized. He requested that his name be dropped from the roll of ministers (which was granted), and he gave notice that he had applied for orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. We wish the stalwart, orthodox Doctor much joy in his new fellowship. But unless his nerves, so sensitive to theological defections, have become atrophied by the attritions of New York, we predict he will find that he has, so to speak, jumped from the frying-pan into the fire. Think of the run-a-muck Percy Stickney Grant! of Leighton Parks, who has put an insolent heretical chip on his shoulder and challenges that he be brought to trial! of Bishops Brown of Arkansas and Lawrence of Massachusetts! of Samuel Davis McConnell (him of the *Confessions of an Old Priest*)! and of a host of others of like ilk too numerous to mention! who present an aggregation of theological aberrations and moral perverseness (because of violation of most solemn ordination vows) that far out-distance every other denomination both lineally and numerically. Really, the Episcopalians need to build at once two new million-dollar institutions: one an asylum for those whose intellects function awry, and the other a reformatory for moral perverts where they can be recovered to the first principles of

common honesty that shall constrain them to keep their solemn vows and honor all other voluntarily assumed obligations. Again we wish Dr. Robertson much joy of his new fellowship.

Dean Inge, of St. Paul's, London, is said to be "the greatest intellectual authority in the Church of England." A cablegram of last December 22 represents him as saying: "Although I should regret exceedingly being termed a 'modernist' in the sense that I side with the American clergymen who started the unhappy situation in the Episcopal church, the fact remains that I consider the proper attitude for a church officer to be negative, so far as miracles are concerned." And he says: "I feel the time has come for the clergy to realize that parishioners are thinking persons. The acceptance of miracles is a matter of pious opinion." That is cool. It is a matter of impious opinion not to accept miracles. The Scriptures undeniably, unequivocally, explicitly and emphatically teach the reality of miracles, both in the Old and New Testaments. And now for a man to deny the reality of miracles is to impeach the veracity of the Bible and make it a conglomerate concatenation of lies. And when this comes to pass, "the proper attitude for a church officer is to be negative," i.e. neutral! Not much, around these "diggins." Says St. Paul: "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom. iii. 4). No stomach-sickening neutrality for us. We propose to take our stand with God every time, and when a man—be he modernist, liberal, rationalist, or what not, in the church pulpit or pew, or out of the church—denies miracles, we take him for just what he is, a . . . a . . . a denier of the truth. These last four words can be condensed to one. Church officers, get some stiffening into your spines that will stand erect against impious opinions.

In June 1922 the Unitarian Layman's League appointed a Committee on Recruiting the Ministry. An item has just come out in the papers which says that this denomination "has no need of more ministers." Is this the result of the work of the Laymen's Committee, or is it due to the influx of apostate Trinitarian ministers? They received thirteen ministers from other denominations last year, and fourteen more were in correspondence with the Committee concerning a change in denominational affiliation. There is a lot more that should go to them! The present slogan, "efficiency," does not seem to be very effective in that fold, for statistics do not show any increase in its membership last year. Still, it must be confessed that Unitarian preachers are accustomed to put up a superior "spiel," from a literary point of view. Their rhetoric is roseate if not robust. Their prelections are of the high brow, college-atmosphere order. But the Christian Century says: "When religion carries with it so much flavor of the university lecture room it is bound to fail." Really, we do not see the need of the Unitarian denomination anyhow, for its work is now being so multitudinously done by the once orthodox denomination. Still, it may have its use as a refuge and receptacle for the theological Adullamites in the other churches.

The Wets have become greatly concerned in behalf of the success of prohition. When the devil was sick the devil a monk would be. They have called a convention of their craft from all over the country to meet in the East to secure the passage of a prohibition law that can be enforced in place of the impossible Volstead act! Isn't that gr-r-r-eat? But when the devil got well the devil of a monk was he. Oh, no, Wets; what you want is what sane and decent people don't want. Can't you see the hand writing on the wall?

Colorado adopted prohibition by a majority of 11,000 and two years later defeated a beer amendment by 85,000.

Michigan adopted prohibition by a majority of 68,000 and three years later defeated a beer and wine amendment by 207,000.

Oklahoma adopted prohibition by a majority of 25,000 and four years later defeated a light wines and beer amendment by more than 200,000.

Oregon adopted prohibition by 36,000 and two years later defeated a beer amendment by 54,000.

Washington adopted prohibition by 18,000 and two years later defeated a beer amendment by 147,000.

It is said that one-fourth of all the Unitarian churches in America are within twenty-five miles of the Boston State House. Boston is the hub. But how about going into all the world to preach the Gospel to every creature, according to our Lord's commission? We recall that Henry W. Bellows once said, at a Unitarian convention in Syracuse, N. Y., that there is no use in attempting to start a Unitarian church in a place of less than twenty thousand population. If the Bible is such

a book as the West Side Unitarian minister made it out to be in his debate with the Baptist Dr. Straton in New York City, we don't see the use of preaching it, anyhow. It would better be confined to the Boston center.

The Rev. Dr. van Dyke, the Sunday after he evacated the First Presbyterian Church of himself, Princeton, N. J., preached in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City, where he had been former pastor more than twenty years. In his exit letter he said he did not want to hear "about Fundamentalists and Modernists, the only subject on which" Professor Machen, the First Church pulpit supply, "seems to have anything to say, and on which most of what he says is untrue and malicious." Professor Machen did not use the word "Fundamentalist" in his sermon at all, but Doctor van Dyke, as reported in the *New York Times,* had quite a bit to say about these creatures. "O wad some power the giftie gie us." His main contention seems to have been to invalidate the "five points" which the General Assembly pronounced to be fundamental. He asks, "When and where did Christ ever teach the inerrancy of Holy Scriptures?" He, being a Liberal, must of course be a profound scholar; but we will excite our temerity sufficient to essay an answer, using the common knowledge we obtained in Sunday-school long ago. Jesus making a quotation from Psalm 82:6, adds, John x. 35, "The Scripture cannot be broken." Isn't that inerrancy? And he says, Luke xvi. 17, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." And he further says, Matt. v. 18, "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The word "law" was a term commonly used for "Holy Scriptures." Here is "inerrancy," and from the terms he used he seems to have made this fact iron clad. The "jot," or *yod,* is the smallest of the Hebrew letters, not much larger than our comma, and the "tittle" (*keraia,* "little horn") is smaller still, being applied to the little apex or tip of the Hebrew consonants or to the point sometimes written in the consonants. Not the smallest letter, or even the tip of a letter, shall pass till all be fulfilled! How could inerrancy be more completely expressed? And says Canon Farrar: "The widest range of learning and the acutest ingenuity of criticism has never discovered one single demonstrable error of fact or doctrine in the Old or New Testament." Of course his reference is to the pure text of Scripture. Oh, yes, Christ taught "inerrancy of Holy Scriptures" all right. Liberals will kindly take notice.

A canvas has been made to ascertain the religious affiliations of the present national Congress. It was found that 76 of the 96 Senators and 373 of the 434 Representatives are members of some church. Seventeen Senators and 41 members of the House were found to have no religious affiliations, while that of 3 Senators and 20 Representatives had not been ascertained.

Of the denominations, the Methodists led in numbers with 96 in the House and 23 in the Senate, 18 Senators are Episcopalians, 14 Presbyterians, 7 Roman Catholic, 5 Congregationalists, 3 Baptists, 2 Mormons, 2 Lutherans, 1 Unitarian and 1 Christian Disciple.

In addition to the ninety-six Methodists, members of the House were divided thus:

Presbyterian, 59; Episcopalian, 56; Baptist, 45; Roman Catholic, 38; Congregationalist, 26; Christian Disciple, 16; Lutheran, 12; Jewish, 9; Unitarian, 4; Dutch Reformed and Quaker, each 3; United Brethren, Mormon, Mennonite, Christian Science, Evangelical and Universalist, each 1. The House tabulation took into account one vacancy.

We are getting some fine specimens of scholarship in sermons of Liberals now-a-days. The Rev. Dr. Leighton Parks, rector of the great and wealthy St. Bartholomew's Church in New York City, in his sermon January 20 is reported in the *New York Times* to have said: "It is known that Matthew, Mark, and Luke were not written by those who had personal contact with Jesus." This must be the "new knowledge" which knows so much that isn't so. It is written in Matt. ix. 9 that "As Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw"—just think of it, actually "saw"—"a man named Matthew," and Jesus called him to be one of his apostles, which call he obeyed and "followed him." Here was "personal contact" for sure. His name is in the catalogs of the apostles, written before and after Jesus' death. And according to the concensus of the ages he is the writer of the Gospel that bears his name. And Dr. Parks is further reported to have siad: "A great deal has been learned about the Bible in the last fifty years that we did not know before. Scholars have discovered many things in studying the New Testament. The first fact is that it is not a book but a library. We find that the various

parts appeared at different times." The present writer was in Sunday-school more than sixty-five years ago, and he does not remember the time when he did not know that the New Testament is a "library," i.e. made up of different books. We would advise Dr. Parks to take a course at White's "Biblical Seminary" and learn things that are so.

THE ARENA

What the Modernists Lack

By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

TOO often it occurs that the modernists accuse evangelical believers of a lack of "scholarship." The former seem to claim a monopoly of that valuable article. And many people are very, very much afraid of such a charge. They are more fearful of being called "unscholarly" than of being called unspiritual or heterodox or disloyal to the Bible and the historic faith.

But we wish to quiet the trepidation of such timid souls. Conservative believers are not lacking in scholarly attainments. When you read their books and articles, you find them posted on everything along the theological, critical and scientific line that appears. Let it be understood that the modernists have no sources of information that are not open to the evangelical element in the church. There is no reason why the conservatives should not read, investigate and reason just as thoroughly and acutely as any one else. The recent books on science, like those of Bateson, Wilson, Osborn, Morgan, Conklin, Scott, Keen, Woodruff, Kammerer, and the rest, are being carefully read and evaluated by those who hold to the plenary Christian faith. Read the works of Robertson, Cave, Orr, Green, Bissell, Bartlett and Wright of the generation just past, and note the scholarly character of their researches. Observe the extensive bibliographies, both radical and evangelical, that they list and cite, and see how extensive and profound their investigations were.

Nor are living scholars behind them in brilliancy of talent. Where will you find the equal of Dr. Robert Dick Wilson in linguistic culture, with all the important semitic languages at his command? It will work the cerebral powers of the modernist to the fagpoint to read and master his recent work on the book of Daniel. Then there are Faulkner, Raven, Zerbe, Mullins, Robertson, Greene, Davis, Machen, Allis, Heagle, and many others, all of them now in the very height of their mental activities. Where have the liberals produced books that are the equal for real scholarship and logic of Faulkner's "Modernism and the Christian Faith," Robertson's "Luke the Historian in the Light of Research," Machen's "The Origin of Paul's Religion," Wilson's "Studies in the Book of Daniel," Good's "The Faith of our Fathers," Clark's "A Syllabus of Systematic Theology" (new edition), Reutherdahl's "Scientific Theism Versus Materialism," Finn's "The Unity of the Pentateuch," Colgrave and Short's "The Historic Faith in the Light of To-day," and Kyle's "The Problems of the Pentateuch?" So, while the conservatives do little boasting about their scholarship, they have no reason to take a back seat in the presence of the latitudinarians.

But we started out to show what the modernists lack. They are lacking in three important essentials: 1. In scientific and philosophical depth; 2. In logical acumen; 3. In ethical consistency. Let us develop these points.

First, they are wanting in scientific and philosophical depth. So far as regards science, they seem to be unable to distinguish between its empirical findings and the speculations of some of the scientists. The scientists must admit that they have never discovered nor produced a case of spontaneous generation. They are always "expecting" to make such a discovery, but they know well enough that thus far they have not succeeded. Indeed, the best of them declare that, so far as actual observation goes, after the most intense efforts, the law of biogenesis holds the field. Yet the modernists in the church go ahead and assert loudly that evolution is the "science" of the day, and that all who dare to question it are steeped in ignorance and traditionalism.

The same is true of the merging of one species into another. The scientists know—and the best of them admit—that, while many interesting variations within the species have been produced by human culture, no distinct species has resulted from men's manipulation. Even if man does bring about wonderful results in the modification of species, nature herself does not bring about such varieties; nor does she preserve them after man's cultural efforts have been removed.

Everybody ought to know therefore that evolution is far from being scientifically demonstrated. Yet the theological liberalists belabor with strong speech all those who will not admit that the theory has been demonstrated. This inability of the modernists to discriminate between speculations and established facts is a sign-manual of their lack of scientific insight. They also fail to see the difference between proof and assertion.

Their ideas of philosophy are also defective. For example, they do not seem to have the sagacity to see that if God evolved life from dead matter instead of creating it; if He evolved all species by infinietesimal steps from one primordial cell instead of creating them; if He evolved man by minute and age-long processes from a single amœba instead of creating him directly in His image—if He did all this, He has hidden Himself so profoundly in laws and tedious processes that He is practically lost to Christian experience as a personally present and working God. To put it otherwise, God is pushed into the dim background or is immured in nature's operation. If God did not perform a miracle in creating man, but employed merely natural forces, the next step is to eliminate all miracles from the Bible, and that destructive method simply scuttles Christianity, which is a supernatural fact and revelation if it is true at all.

The modernists seem also to be unable to grasp the fact that, if God is personally active in the process of development, that activity nullifies evolution; for then God must constantly be adding new energy to the process; but evolution means an unfolding process by means of *resident* forces, not of new forces injected from without. There can be no such thing as theistic evolution; it is a contradiction of terms. One might consistently allow the term *deistic* evolution. That would mean that God created the primordial material, incorporated in it all the needed secondary forces for its subsequent development, and then retired from it to let it run itself. But that is the old Deism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which proved its futility long ago. Moreover, the modernist will not consent to the idea of an absentee God, but constantly emphasizes the divine immanence.

In still another respect he—the modernist—reveals his lack of philosophical thoroughness. By ruling out the miraculous element from the New Testament, he fails to assign an adequate cause for the influence of Christ, the power and success of Pentecost, and the rise of Christianity. If the New Testament is true, every event in the progress of Christianity is adequately explained. A sufficient cause has been assigned. Remove the supernatural events, such as Christ's miraculous conception, the song of the heralding angels, the miracles of Jesus, His transfiguration, His atoning death, His resurrection and ascension, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and you have the most marvellous spiritual phenomenon in the world's history, namely, Christianity, without an adequate cause. Why the modernists cannot grasp these facts is one of the present-day psychological mysteries.

The modernists also lack logical acumen. They seem to be unable to see that an errant Bible leaves Christianity in the lurch. Everything becomes uncertain. If one man can throw out something that does not suit him, another man can do the same with some other part. There is, in fact, much diversity of opinion among those who treat the Bible in the rationalistic way. The Universalist accepts what suits him; the Unitarian what suits him; the Christian Science healer what suits him. Among the modernists themselves there is no consensus, some verging clear over to Unitarianism and some holding on to a part of the evangelical faith. Some months ago Dr. Fosdick told the Unitarians to their faces that they were utterly wrong, and had no real Saviour. More recently Dr. Merrill, Dr. Kelman, Dr. Alexander, and Dr. Van Dyke have made declarations that sound almost as if they had come back to the orthodox view, even averring that they believe in the virgin birth of Christ, that "biological miracle" which Dr. Fosdick could not abide some while ago. Yet the four men named all train under the banner of modernism. Besides, a few months ago they spoke disparagingly, to say the least, of the virgin birth. Thus, professing to be guided by reason, the modernists fail to be logically consistent.

Some of the modernists reject the virgin

birth because it involves a biological miracle. Yet they want to hold to the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ. Then He must have been immaculately conceived, although born of Joseph and Mary. But that would have also been a biological miracle. How can they accept one biological miracle while they discard another? Some of them also reject the virgin birth, but hold on to the doctrine of Christ's resurrection. But Christ's resurrection must also have been a wonderful biological miracle.

Some of the modernists who reject the virgin birth of Christ insist on holding to the fact of a divine incarnation. Here again their logic goes limping, for if Christ was naturally engendered, He would have been a human person, and there would have been no divine incarnation. If the person of the Logos joined Himself with the human person Jesus, that would have been only a mystical union, such as all regenerated persons experience; and thus Christ would not have been a unique being. Those who depend so much on reason ought to reason correctly. The only possible method by which a divine incarnation could occur would be this: For the divine Person of the eternal Son to permit Himself, in veriest condescension and self-surrender, to be ensphered by the Holy Spirit in human nature, and then function through that human nature. Cannot any one who reasons closely see that this method would be a real divine incarnation? Well, then, all the conditions are fulfilled in the New Testament narratives of the miraculous conception and virgin birth of our Lord. Logic will also lead the thinker to see that this is the only way by which Christ could be both divine and human; one person with two natures; "the Word made flesh;" "Immanuel, God with us;" "God manifest in the flesh." The best logic is that which follows the Bible. Proud human reason leads into many inextricable logical fallacies, especially when it undertakes to pronounce judgment on spiritual verities.

In regard to real progress the modernists do not seem to be able to follow a straight line of reasoning. There can be progress without evolution. The Bible teaches that the cosmogony of the world was progressive. Just read the first chapter of Genesis and see. God first created the universal ether or some other primordial material; at first it was in a state of darkness and quietness; then followed movement and light; the firmament (*rakia*, expanse, atmosphere) was then formed; after which followed the separation of the land and the water of the earth; then came the earliest forms of life, the vegetable kingdom; in orderly succession came the lower, then the higher animal forms, and at last man, the highest being, appeared. Does not all this indicate a progressive creation and cosmogony? And it agrees most wonderfully with the fairly well established facts of geological science. Thus we can accept the Genetical account of the creation at its face value and still believe in progress. Indeed, the whole Bible is a progressive revelation—creation, preservation, providence, redemption, divine purpose in human life, and finally eternal destiny. What better progress could any one desire? Moreover, the process of grace in the soul is a progressive sanctification, like the working of the leaven in the meal.

And yet the modernists possess so little logical insight that they berate Biblical believers as "static" Christians. And to believe the whole Bible is archaic and procrustean! To believe that God created the first man and woman by a direct act as rational beings in His own image—ah, that is reactionary, "backnumberish," non-progressive! But to believe that man was evolved from the brutes by a slow, humdrum process, demanding myriads of ages, so that it took "his ancestors about a million years to learn to walk on their hind legs"—oh, that is *so, so very* "progressive!"

In still another way the modernists fail to reason clearly and accurately. They cannot see who are "the troublers in Israel." They really blame the evangelical element in the church for all the factional strife now going on. The fallacy of this accusation is surely due to the blindness of the historical and spiritual sense. Twenty-five to fifty years ago the churches were moving along in comparative peace. The denominational quarrels were pretty well quieted. Here and there may have been a local fight. But there was no widespread difficulty. Practically all the large denominations were true to the plenary faith. They stood faithfully for the Bible and the doctrinal bases which they had voluntarily adopted. The missionary enterprise was going forward. Progress was being made in both the home and the foreign fields. The gospel was preached in nearly all the pulpits of the evangelical church in its fullness.

Then what occurred? The rationalistic temper began to intrude itself. Certain would-be learned professors became wiser

than the Bible, and began more or less cryptically to pick it to pieces. This soon was proclaimed as "the new knowledge." Ere long the theory of evolution began to come into vogue, and almost always it was set up against Genesis, which was pronounced myth, legend, or Hebrew folklore. Was it to be presumed that all this shredding of the Bible would go forward without protest? Surely not. Keen-eyed men foresaw its destructive character, and felt it to be their duty to speak out. In England protests came from men like James Robertson, Alfred Cave, James Orr, Andrew M. Fairbairn, Henry A. Redpath and Henry Wace; while here in America the sturdy voices of men like William Henry Green, Edwin Cone Bissel, Samuel Colford Bartlett, Benjamin G. Warfield and George Frederick Wright were heard. After them other defenders entered the arena. But all these Nestors arose in defense of the faith only because the so-called "new theology" had invaded the peaceful domain of the evangelical church. And now its exponents have cut a cross section clear through her from side to side and from end to end. Cannot anybody see who began the trouble? The modernists with their destructive unbiblical doctrines are responsible for the present upheaval in Christendom. They will have to give an account to God for thus rending the body of Christ.

In the next place the modernists are lacking in ethical consistency. We do not want to use any severer term if we can help it. Their wrong-going consists in this: They united with the evangelical church by making certain declarations of their faith and taking certain solemn obligations to uphold and proclaim the denominational doctrines and principles. In not all denominations did they make verbal assent to a particular body of doctrine, but in every case it was at least tacitly understood by all parties that they adopted the convictions and doctrines of the denomination with which they voluntarily identified themselves. No one could imagine why they should want to unite with a particular denomination if they did not heartily accept its well-known tenets and form of government. In no case were they compelled to join any particular communion, or any church at all, for that matter.

But now the modernists insist on repudiating their original declarations and promises, publicly pronouncing against the doctrines of the communions to which they belong, accepting the livings that the evangelical church affords them, holding prominent, honorable and lucrative position within its domain, and claiming the right to be free lances in matters of faith; even while they are undermining and denouncing the doctrines of the very organization that supports them. Is that a mark of ethical consistency? Is it not a mark of inability to distinguish between order and anarchy? How long could any organization hold together under such circumstances? A lodge would make short work with such iconoclasts. A government could not stand by and permit such anarchistic advocacy to prevail.

The question of liberty and so-called "academic freedom" is not pertinent. Nobody, surely, ought to be at liberty to undermine the principles of the organization which he has voluntarily joined and whose tenets he has promised to promulgate and defend. That is license, not liberty. If he no longer believes what the organization teaches, he is at perfect liberty to withdraw. Would that not be the ethical procedure?

It may be said that such procedure would stop all progress in the church. Oh, no! In the first place, the tenets of modernism have not been proven to be in the interests of true progress. Its theology is so nebulous, so negative and so illy established that it is more likely to be reactionary than forward-looking. To reject the Bible and cast the church adrift on the tumbling sea of rationalism cannot be said to be a mark of progress. History is against it. Rationalism in other countries has led to agnosticism, pessimism and Nietzschianism. Nothing in human experience is clearer than that unaided human reason never has gotten far along the line of progress in ethical and spiritual matters. It does not lead along the path that "shineth more and more unto the perfect day;" no, it is more apt to lead into the darkness, the mire and the clay.

Is this an invitation for all the modernists to "get out?" Let it be said kindly but firmly, perhaps that would be better than to continue to be disturbers of the peace and stand in the way of the church's progress in winning souls and pushing forward her missionary work. However, a better way would be for the modernists to come back to the true faith and be soundly converted to its grace and power, so that their many intellectual gifts and spiritual qualities might be fully surrendered to the real advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ.

But is not this proposal "patronizing?"

Does it not spell an embargo on the intellect? No; we think not. Evangelical Christianity is not rationalistic. Christian people receive their experience of truth and pardon through faith in Christ and His Word. The Holy Spirit enlightens their minds and regenerates their hearts, and that enables them to think all the more clearly, and pursue the intellectual way without pride and conceit, which are more apt to stand in the way of true intellectual progress than to enhance and encourage it. The Bible itself gives us this enjoinder: "Add to your faith knowledge, and to knowledge virtue." Christian faith does not encourage mental sloth. It is a spur to intellectual progress, because it sees God and good in the pursuit of knowledge. If the vital and fundamental problems of truth and salvation in Christ are solved, one can follow the radiant path of culture and research with joyful, yes, with lyrical courage and confidence.

Saint James

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

WHO is the author of the Epistle of James? An answer is in its first verse: "James, a servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ."

But who is this James? Possibly nearly all are ready to answer with one voice, "Why, of course the Apostle James." Let us see; for several Jameses are named in the New Testament.

James I

In the Catalog of the Apostles (Matt. x. 2 and Mark iii. 17) are named "James, the son of Zebedee, and John his brother." Let us call this one James I.

He and John, with Peter, constituted the trio that were Christ's most intimate disciples—the apostolic "ring" some might say—being the only ones with him on such important occasions as the transfiguration (Matt. xvi. 1), the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Mk. v. 37), and the agony in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 37). But in Acts xii. 2 we find that this James was put to death by Herod Agrippa I, thus becoming the first apostolic martyr. So this cannot be the James that appears three chapters farther on as the head of the Jerusalem church (xv. 13.) Besides, the date of the martyrdom of James is put April 1, A. D. 44, while the date of the writing of the Epistle is by many put on into the sixties. So this apostle could not have written it.

James II

In these catalogs there is named a second James, "James, the son of Alpheus." Let us call him James II. Did he write it?

In Matt. xiii. 55, we read: "Is not this [Jesus] the carpenter's son? is not his mother Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?"

So Jesus had a brother by the name of James. St. Paul, in Gal. i. 18, 19, tells of going up to Jerusalem for a fifteen days' visit to Peter, and says that he saw no other apostle "but only James, the Lord's brother." It seems to me plain that James II, the second apostle by that name, who is the son of Alpheus, and James the Lord's brother who is the son of Joseph, are to be sharply distinguished as two distinct persons. If this be so, then we shall have another James, whom let us call

James III

It should be said, however, in all fairness, that the identity, the oneness, of these two has been stoutly maintained by some excellent expositors—the literature on the "James question" is voluminous—and as stoutly denied by others.

To me there is one decisive and sufficient reason against the identicalness of these two, viz.: At the very time James II., the son of Alpheus, was one of the Twelve apostles, this third James and his brothers and sisters were "offended" at Jesus (Matt. xiii. 57), or, as John puts it, did not "believe in him" (vii. 5). And another fact is significant: at the last, while still upon the cross, Jesus committed his mother to the care of Apostle John (Jno. xix. 25-27), instead of to his brother James or any of the others. This would indicate that they were still unbelieving.

In I Cor. xv., St. Paul supplies a fact which may mean much. Speaking of Christ's posthumous appearances, he says: "He was seen

of Cephas, then of the Twelve; after that he was seen of above 500 brethren at once; . . . . after that he was seen of James." What is wrapped up in this statement concerning James?

That Christ had been crucified and buried James could not deny. But here he was, alive again! his resurrection, a stupendous miracle, the seal of his Messiahship, and proof of his Divinity. The unbeliever yielded to the force of the evidence and became a believer, as evidently did the rest of the family; for we read, Acts i. 13, 14, that, after the ascension, the apostolic company and other believers were "with one accord" in supplication with "Mary the mother of Jesus and with his brethren."

Now, the question recurs, Which of these two Jameses wrote the Epistle? Was it James II., the second apostle, the son of Alpheus, whom Mark calls "James the Less" (xv. 40)? I think not, for, says Farrar in his book, *The Early Days of Christianity*, "This 'James the Little,' or 'James the son of Alpheus,' is to us a name and nothing more. Not one incident is narrated of him; not one utterance is attributed to him in the gospels; not one fact is preserved respecting him by any tradition older than those recorded, or accepted, or invented by Nicephorus in the fourteenth century" (p. 310). It may be added that, according to tradition, he labored in Egypt, where he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion in the city of Ostrakene.

If the foregoing be accepted, then we are shut up to the conclusion that this James III., the brother of our Lord, who was not one of the twelve apostles at all, wrote the Epistle. None of the facts seem to me to militate against this conclusion, and all seem to favor it; and therefore I accept it.

Saint James—his Training and Character

Thus knowing who the author of the Epistle is, we would like to know more particularly about the man himself.

James' father, Joseph, is characterized by St. Matthew as "a just man" (i. 19). This term conveys to Jewish ears a more definite meaning than it does to ours. It means not only that he was fair and honorable and upright, as we see that his conduct was in every incident of Christ's nativity and infancy in which he bore a part, but also that he made it his special study to meet all the requirements of the Mosaic law.

A "just man" was one who paid tithes; who went to the yearly feasts; who kept the one yearly fast; who was scrupulous in the observance of the Sabbath; who attended the synagog; who used the prescribed prayers; who observed the rules of Levitical purification; who reverenced the great Rabbis; who wore fringes and phylacteries; who made a constant study of the commandments, the precepts, the judgments, the testimonies of the law. To be a just man according to the Jewish ideal, was to be "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And such a man would strenuously endeavor to train his household to walk in the same way as himself.

James was educated and trained in such a household. He was reared in an atmosphere of rigid Judaism, perhaps not untinged with that fervid patriotism and unbounded appreciation of the privileges of the Jewish people which was characteristic of the Galilean.

More than that. According to Hegesippus, of the second century, fragments of whose writings have come down to us in the works of Eusebius, who is styled "the father of church history," James was a Nazarite. As a Nazarite he would be regarded as holy even from infancy. The Nazarite's vow was one which devoted him to the cause of God. He never tasted wine nor strong drink. He never ate animal food. The scrupulous cleanliness of Levitism, which arose from its abhorrence of defilement from any creeping thing, led him always to wear robes of pure white linen because woolen substances could not be kept so absolutely clean.

There are traces in Scripture that the Nazarites were regarded with peculiar pride. Says Jeremiah in Lam. iv. 7, "Thy Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing was of sapphire." All that would tend to produce stern strength and holy severity of character went into James' make up. We do not wonder, therefore, that he earned the title of "James the Just." And we can readily see that with his strict and scrupulous regard for the Mosaic law and the traditions of the past, any one who would depart therefrom in the role of a reformer, or even seem to do so, would naturally fall under his disapprobation. This would account for his break with Jesus. But convinced by the resurrection and attendant facts, of Jesus' Messiahship, we can easily see that with his whole soul he would cleave to the cause of the Crucified.

What more natural, then, than that upon

the martyrdom of James I, this James, with his exalted character and his commanding personal influence, and still more because of his nearness to the Lord himself as the eldest of his brothers, should be looked to, to take the leadership of the believers in Jesus at Jerusalem? This position fell to him by the necessary fitness of things. Much more might be said, but these brief hints may possibly give us a clearer conception of the man himself.

His Times

It will help to a better understanding of the Epistle if we get a clear view of the situation back there.

We have the Bible, a completed book: we see the Church an organized and equipped institution. They had only the Old Testament. They had no church, or rather they were themselves the beginning of a Church: it was just forming. They were converted Jews; but converted to what? They believed in the Old Testament, offered the Old Testament sacrifices, conformed to the Old Testament ritual. But converted to what? I suppose it will be sufficient to say, converted to a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. But what does that mean? How much does it involve? Questions, indeed!

The revelation of Christ had broken upon them like the full dawn of the morning. A new life had begun—intellectual, moral, social—teeming with elements which could not but work and expand. With what force and in what direction? The Father revealed, the Son incarnate, the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; new principles of thought; new standards of character; new grounds of duty; new motives; new powers; new bonds between man and man; new forms of human society—all coming at once upon men's minds, placed them, as it were, in a different world from that in which they had lived before. At the same time they carried into that world of thought the teaching of the past whether of Scripture or unscriptural tradition, all the tendencies, infirmities and perversities of our nature, and revealed truth had to settle itself into lasting forms, to find its adequate expression, and to have its moral and social consequences deduced, under a variety of influences uncongenial to itself. So critical a period, on which the whole future of the Church hung, would seem to cry aloud for a continued action of the Word of God, such as might with supreme authority both judge and guide the thoughts of men, and translate the principles which they had received, into life and practice. The Lord recognized the necessity, and He met it by the living voice of the Apostles, and by the writings of those who were inspired by the Holy Ghost to write.

Still further, in getting an understanding of the situation, there is a time element that needs to be taken into the account.

Christ's crucifixion occurred in the year 33. At Pentecost, about fifty days later, the Church was founded at Jerusalem, and for some years its progress was almost exclusively among the Jews. Paul was converted, say, in January 37. He spent three years in Arabia, preparing, as is supposed, for his mission to the Gentiles. He began his missionary work.

There were then two great movements in the Church: the one, Jewish, in close contact with Judaism, of which the strict Nazarite James was the head and exponent; the other, Gentile, the tendency of which was to break away from Judaism, and of which Paul was the head and exponent. These two movements were more or less antagonistic, because the relation between the old Judaism and the new Faith had not yet been made to appear.

But the movements must not eventuate in two Churches. They must go on in the one Church, and they must be made to harmonize. Accordingly in March, A. D. 50, Judaism and Gentilism met in Council in Jerusalem as recorded in Acts xv., and the truth and a policy were evolved by which the two movements were adjusted to each other and consolidated into one.

The Epistles of the New Testament are in part the instrument, as they are the record, of the Church's development. Paul's church epistles were for the Gentiles, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, while those of Peter and James were for the Jews. And unless we take these separate points of view, we shall fail to understand either set of Epistles.

Thus considering the time element, we see that for twenty years or more all the instruction the Church had for its guidance was the oral teaching of the Apostles and others who assumed the position of teachers. Something authoritative and that could be appealed to for guidance was needed. The needs of the Church became the occasion of writing the Epistles, and what was adapted to the then needs would, as circumstances suited, be adapted to future needs as well.

James, as a Jew and head of the Jerusalem church, writes to the Jews, or as he puts it in the first verse, "To the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad;" and although at the

Jerusalem Council (Acts xv.) he expressed the mind of the Apostles and brethren there, regarding the liberty of Gentile believers, he never otherwise seems to have addressed himself in any way to the Gentiles. Though ten of the tribes had been lost from human sight for centuries, still to James as to Elijah on Carmel the twelve tribes were still existent to his faith and in the purpose of God. The Epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Christian Jews in Palestine; the Epistles of Peter to the Jewish Dispersion who dwelt in Asia Minor; the Epistle of James to the Jews wherever scattered.

And those were troublous times for the Jews as a national people, in that, in addition to persecution, they were liable to be drawn away from the proper path of scriptural living. James writes to comfort and admonish them. He does so as a Hebrew Christian, and nothing more. Probably you who have read the Epistle with thoughtful care, have noticed that the distinctively Christian and spiritual elements are more lacking in this than in any other Epistle. Twice only does he mention the name of Christ. Not once does he use the word "gospel." Not once does he allude to the work of Redemption, or to the Incarnation, or the Resurrection, or the Ascension. Plainly his purpose was not theological, but practical. He does not set forth truths for creeds, but precepts for deeds. As some one has well said: "When we leave the Holy of Holies in the Epistle to the Hebrews, James takes us by the hand to lead us through the world." The Epistle was for the practical guidance and comfort of Jews, though of course this does not exclude the application of its truths to others.

The Epistle

As to the contents of the Epistle, it is very difficult if not quite impossible to give an analysis of them, for it is not written on any formal plan. The style is very abrupt, and James goes from topic to topic without connecting sentences, for he is too much in earnest to waste words.

In the November number of the *Biblical World,* 1894, a writer fabricates a letter dated Jerusalem, A. D. 50-65, in which he gives what purports to be an interview with James in regard to what led him to write the Epistle. Things were going bad. James had traveled among the Jewish churches, and had corresponded with Peter, Andrew, Thomas, Matthew, and others. In response to the interviewer's questions, he drew from his pocket a note book and read a catalog of the prevalent sins of which he had learned either from observation or report. There were twenty specifications: Unsteadfastness, lack of wisdom, envy, blaming God, unholy zeal, hypocrisy, obsequiousness, formalism, foolish ambitions, recriminations, angry words, jealousy, faction, lust, worldliness, pride, love of money, disregard of Providence, impatience at our Lord's delayed return, swearing."

Pretty black, that. Yet considering what goes wrong now, when we have the New Testament to guide and correct us, we ought not to be very hard on those back there who had no New Testament. And these are the sins aimed at in the Epistle.

Let us take just a glance at the course of thought by chapters.

Chapter I

Verses 1-4, writing to those who are suffering trials, he exhorts them to endurance.

Vs. 5-8, but if they lack wisdom, they must ask for it with whole-hearted desire.

Vs. 9-11, the enemy of whole-heartedness is often worldly wealth, and he therefore tells them how blessed poverty may be, and how transitory riches are.

Vs. 12-15, since poverty is in itself a trial, he shows the blessedness of enduring the trials which, while they come in the semblance of trials from God, have their origin in lust and their end death.

Vs. 16-18, only the good and perfect gifts come from God, and above all the gift of our birth by the Word of Truth.

Vs. 19-21, then let them in meekness and purity live worthy of the Word of Truth.

Vs. 22-25, let them be doers and not mere hearers of it, and let them

Vs. 26, 27, learn to distinguish between external service and the true ritual of loving unselfishness.

Chapter II

Verses 1-13, passing to some of their special national faults, he sternly rebukes the factitious respects paid to persons, contrary to Christ's ideal, and a sin against the perfect law of liberty.

Vs. 14-26, perhaps because he saw the origin of this selfish arrogance and abject servility in the reliance which they placed on a nominal orthodoxy, he enters into the question about faith and works, showing that faith, in his sense of the word, is dead and valueless without works.

Chapter III

Verses 1-12, he powerfully warns them against the sins of the tongue in passion and controversy; and then,

Vs. 13-18, to show them that the loudest and angriest talker is not therefore in the right, he draws a contrast between true and false wisdom.

Chapter IV

Verses 1-10, the source of the evils on which he has been dwelling is the unbridled lust which springs from worldliness; therefore they need humility and the determination to fight against sin, and sincere repentance; which will show itself

Vs. 11,12, in an avoidance of evil speaking; and

Vs. 13-17, in a deeper sense that their life is wholly in God's disposing hand.

Chapter V

Verses 1-6, he bursts into a strong denunciation of the rich who live in pride, oppression, and self-indulgence; while

Vs. 7-11, he comforts the poor and counsels them to patience.

V. 12, he warns against careless oaths; gives

Vs. 13-15, counsels for the time of sickness; advises.

V. 16, mutual confession of sins; dwells once more,

Vs. 16-20, on the efficiency of prayer as shown in the example of Elijah; and ends somewhat abruptly with a weighty declaration of the blessedness of converting others.

If the question were asked, "What one word sums up this Epistle?" the reply would be "Works."

The epistolary writers have spoken to us in different, but not discordant, voices. St. John is the Apostle of Love; Peter of Hope; Paul of Faith; while St. James vehemently impresses the necessity of Works,—works which are the combined result of constraining love, purifying hope, and operative faith. There is not, as Luther at one time mistakenly maintained, a conflict between Paul's justification by faith only, and James' justification by works only. They cover different spaces of meaning. With Paul, you believe in order to be saved; with James, you work because you are saved. Faith is the means or instrument to justification; works the evidence and proof of justification. So they stand, not face to face beating each other, but back to back beating off common foes.

This whole presentation may emphasize James' exhortation: "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the Word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass; for he beholdeth himself and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, the man shall be blessed in his deed" (i. 22-25).

"The Word of God, by faith received;
Imparts regeneration;
And he who hath in Christ believed,
Lives out a new creation.
But if we hear and do it not,
We hear for condemnation,
For 'doers of the Word,' we're taught,
Are heirs of Christ's salvation."

* * *

The Great Book

By Christopher G. Hazard, D.D.,
Catskill, New York

Word upon gilded and fluttering pages,
Wind of the Spirit and light of the ages,
Stream of salvation, fountain of history,
Truth's revelation, humanity's mystery;
Ever reflecting light gladdening and golden,
Stirred by the sighs of God, modern and olden;
Worked by the sign of Love's passionate death,
Power of His sacrifice, child of His breath;
Progress outstrips it not, time cannot dim it;
New generations rise, greet it, and hymn it!

* * *

A Boer marksman in the South African war who, having killed an Irish soldier began to strip him of his clothes. He took off the overcoat and tunic; and then saw something that called a sudden halt. On the breast of the Irish soldier was a crucifix. The marksman stood looking at it, silent, spell-bound; then covered the body and walked away. The gulf that separated between him and his enemy had closed up. And the Cross had done it! The same influence is bringing the nations together today, and bringing them together under the benignant sway of One who is destined to reign as King over the whole Israel of God.—*David James Burrell, D. D.*

* * *

Many men owe the grandeur of their lives to their tremendous difficulties.—Spurgeon.

The Council of Hades—A Story

By Henry J. Zelley, D.D., Salem, New Jersey

Chapter I—The President of the Council

THE common conception of Satan had its origin in the writings of Dante and Milton and not in the Bible. The Bible reveals him, before his fall, as "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty." He was the angel "that covereth," or the one whose special duty seemed to have been to stand next to the eternal throne, and was its special guardian. He may have been "Heaven's Secretary of State" to whom was committed the general supervision of God's universal empire. After his fall he is called "Lucifer, son of the morning," and in him may be seen "magnificence in ruins."

He is as truly a personality as man himself, and is not a "principle of evil," or the creature of human imagination. Some may deny this, but doubt never changes a fact. Rev. Alfred J. Hough has well said:—

"Men don't believe in the devil now as their fathers used to do,
They've forced the door of the broadest creed to let his majesty through;
There isn't a print of his cloven foot or a fiery dart from his brow,
To be found in earth or air today, for the world has voted so.

"Won't somebody step to the front forthwith and make his bow and show
How the frauds and crimes of a single day spring up? We want to know.
The devil was fairly voted out, and of course, the devil's gone,
But simple people would like to know who carries his business on."

The belief that he is in hell is not Scriptural. Three times Jesus spoke of him as "The prince of this world," and the inspired Paul refers to him as "the prince of the power of the air." Though cast out of heaven and reigning on earth, he still has access to God and appeared before Him to brand Job as a hypocrite, sought to "sift Peter," or stands as the "accuser of the brethren."

He watched with intense interest the spread of the gospel in the home and foreign fields, and decided that something must be done to stop its progress. He hates the human race because unto man is committed "the ministry of reconciliation." Every professed Christian led into apostasy, and every sinner kept from Christ, is counted by him as a great victory over Christ and his Gospel.

He looked about for some means of defeating God's plan for human redemption. He wisely concluded that the attack must be secretly made, and that his agents must be carefully selected. He knew that skilled human leadership was necessary, and that it must be secured from within the Church. He knew that men of culture, and refinement, and piety, would be his best instruments, for he recognized the fact "that there is but a step from the sublimest faith to the wildest fanaticism."

Once seriously contemplating he discovered a company of ministers who, though cultured and devoted to their calling, had somehow lost their vision of the Divine Christ.* Instead of crying to God, like David, to "restore to them the joy of salvation," they undertook to formulate a creed that would harmonize with their changed experiences.

Satan rejoiced at the discovery of this group and said, "I have found what I need and must prepare these men for my great task." And the smile that overspread his face was a suggestion of the perfect beauty which he possessed before his sad fall.

Chapter II—The Meeting of the Council

It was a bright Monday morning more than a score of years ago when this group of ministers assembled in an Eastern city to talk over their problems and discuss plans for the future of their respective parishes and the great Church with which they were connected.

In the course of the conversation one said, "I can't get people to decide publicly for Christ, as I could in my earlier ministry. If I have a personal conversation and urge the importance of Church membership, a few persons will consent to join and are received. I wonder if the trouble lies in me or in the Church itself."

After some discussion another replied, "We all seem to share your experience; I believe the fault may be discovered in the Church. We are too strict in our requirements for membership and our doctrines are not believed as formerly. I must confess that I have more 'rubber' in my conscience than I had a few years ago. Someone said "I don't think it

*This confusion of thought was the result of the absorption of heresies imported from Germany.

atters what a man believes, so long as his ife conforms to the high standards of morali-. The Church should be broadened and ade more attractive to the world."

"That's correct," the first speaker replied, and I think that James was right when he aid, 'Pure religion and undefiled before God ne Father is this, to visit the fatherless and idows in their affliction and to keep himself nspotted from the world.' What do we eed more than that?"

The wit of the company said, "It's all right o visit the widows; and James doesn't say ow often nor how prolonged the visits hould be."

This was followed by a roar of laughter, fter which the chairman said, "There is but ne thing for us to do, and that is to liberalize he Church, so that there will be no slavish dherence to an outgrown creed, nor objec-ion made to the young people of the Church aving a good time in society. Then we shall e able to secure more rich and influential nen and women as members, and secure the ttendance and support of the young people of he world. I would suggest that each of us hink out carefully a plan for the accom-plishment of that purpose and submits it at ur next meeting, and we can select the best, r make a composite of them that will be sat-sfactory to all."

While one af the ministers acted as chair-nan of the meeting, the real President of the Council was present, though unseen, and di-ected the program of this and all subsequent neetings, in the same manner employed by im in Eden, though different living creatures vere used in the accomplishment of his pur-ose.

Chapter III—The Plan

The next meeting of the Council was an nthusiastic one, attended by about twenty-ive ministers and educators. They present-d their plans, compared them, and finally lecided upon a general program. It was ecognized that they could not hope for suc-ess by an open attack upon the fundamentals f the faith, for that would arouse all loyal Christians to a defence of their faith.

They agreed to follow the example inspired y their invisible president, and sow the tares vhile the saints were asleep. They knew that hey could do little harm to the Church from vithout, and so decided to work quietly from vithin. They decided by a unanimous vote, hat the Church must be "liberalized" and a ecret propoganda started at once. The plan included emphasis upon the hypothesis of evolution, the denial of an inerrant Bible, and the minimizing of the supernatural.

The group dispersed to begin the propaganda. One preached about the wonderful evolution of man from his savage state, and said, "a monument should be erected to the man, if his name can be learned, who arranged the gutteral sounds made by our savage ancestors, into an intelligible language." Another denied the fact of demoniacal possessions as described in the New Testament and said, "the conditions described were doubtless the results of melancholia, epilepsy, or insanity, and where Jesus is said to have cast out demons, it was only the erroneous beliefs of the Apostles grafted upon the sayings of Jesus."

Others sneeringly referred to the doctrine of holiness, and said that such belief in that outgrown doctrine was a proof of fanaticism, ignoring the fact that the Bible declares that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." And all of them took special delight in denying the words of Jesus, who said, "If I go away I will come again."

The people listened to these strange utterances and questions arose in their minds, but they said, "Are not these ministers holy men called of God to their high office, and have they not avowed to defend the Church against all false doctrines, and preach only the revealed Word of God?" And believing this they entered no protest and gradually the poison was absorbed, their experiences clouded, their zeal slackened and their love for and loyalty to the Church died away, and the invisible President of the Council smiled.

Chapter IV
The Effect of the Propaganda

A meeting of the Council was held at which the members reported their success in "putting across" their novel doctrines, and all rejoiced that there had been so few protests from the laity. A few orthodox ministers had challenged their teaching, but the great mass of ministers and laymen had remained silent.

Perhaps the greatest impression had been made upon young ministers who had not learned to do independent thinking, but were glad to echo anything heard from those who were in authority or occupied high places. Some of these delight in quoting anything startlingly new, just as they consider it a proof of superior scholarship and originality to read "The Shorter Bible" in public instead of the Authorized Version of 1611.

One of the members suggested that they must manifest great respect for the Bible as literature, and that it would be wise to organize classes for its study in all educational institutions under the control of the Church, and make such study a part of each curriculum. "Will not a better knowledge of the Bible defeat our plan to overthrow its authority as the Word of God?" was asked. "Most certainly" was the reply, "if the students are permitted to use the Bible as the text-book. We must not allow them to study the Bible, but *about* the Bible, and we must be very careful that the text-books selected shall be such as shall present the liberal interpretation, rather than the conservative."

"But will the Church stand for this?" was the next question. "It certainly will" was the reply, "for the people are intellectually lazy and prefer to accept the conclusions of others, rather than study or reason their way to conclusions of their own. They will not be as critical as the elderly lady, who questioned, when told that a certain breakfast food was pre-digested, "Who by?" After enjoying a good laugh, someone said, "and they will not know our purpose until it is too late."

A list of radical books was selected by the Council and sent through the proper authorities of the Church to the various institutions, and in every case, books from this approved list were chosen. This work was continued until the Council had secured authority to designate the books to be studied by theological students and those who were preparing themselves for missionary fields; and for this purpose they selected such as would covertly undermine or openly attack the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

This continued until all young ministers and missionaries were taught unbelief instead of faith; and the power of the Council increased until it was asserted that there was not a president, nor member of the faculty of any educational institution of the Church, nor a pastor in any of its leading pulpits, who had not been selected or approved by the Council.

And the invisible president of the Council rubbed his hands in glee.

Chapter V—The Press Captured

The next attack was made upon the Church press and it was but a short time before the effects of the "submarine" offensive was seen. Radical articles appeared, and at first the editors, when called to account, apologized for permitting them to have been published, but gradually these articles became more numerous, and the protests ceased, and finally every official publication became "liberal" in its teaching; and more than that: it became antagonistic to the Bible as inerrant, and to the fundamental doctrines of the Church and the Bible.

In addition to their radical teaching, all of them, with scarcely an exception, refused to publish the articles in defence of the faith that were sent to them in reply to the heresies published, and the false accusations made against the defenders of the faith. It soon became apparent that this plan was being pushed to the limit, when orthodox books were refused publication and advertisement, and liberal books were issued, advertised, and sold, by the representatives of the Church.

Nowhere was the victory of the Council more apparent than in the Sunday School literature of the Church, and tons of rationalistic matter were circulated among the youth through this channel. The effect was seen in blighted lives and a lost faith that may end in ruined souls. They were told that the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel was not a miracle, that the dividing of the waters was "not an unusual phenomenon at this place. A strong southeast wind, by driving the waters of the lake northward, together with a simultaneous ebb of the tide in the lower gulf, might easily produce the effect described in the text."

Of the ascension of Christ they were told, "This, of course, does not imply that His physical form was lifted into some physical heaven, the focalizing of which is a wholly needless piece of speculation. It was a dematerialization of the same order as those that preceded it. The story of the ascension was only a fabrication of Luke."

The younger children were told "Man once walked on all fours and climbed like the monkey. Like the monkey, too, he had a natural coat of hair, and had no need of clothes. It was by covering the body more and more with clothes that mankind gradually lost the hairy covering."

One of the spokesmen of the Council said, "Voltaire and Payne were men of great intellectual acumen, and though not spiritual, were specialists in their class, and should be listened to with attention." And a book of which he is the author gives abundant proof that he had "listened to them with attention."* It might seem to be uncharitable for

*Some had departed so far from the truth as to take part in conventions of unbelievers, and deliver memorial addresses in honor of noted infidels before rationalist societies.

man to say of these teachers what God has said, "Professing themselves to be wise they have become fools."

As these things emanated from the Council and were accepted by the reader as true, the invisible president of the Council danced for joy.

Chapter VI—The New Evangelism

It is not surprising that such men as composed the Council of Hades, and received their inspiration from its invisible president, should ignore the spiritual in their control of the machinery of the Church which they had captured and were using for their own purposes.

They decided that something must be done to increase the membership of the Church, and that the new members must be in harmony with them and their plans. They knew that "twice-born" men and women would hinder, rather than help them, and adopted a substitute for the oldtime Spirit-inspired revivals, in which persons were convicted of sin, and after sincere repentance, were justified by faith and regenerated by the Holy Spirit.

A call was made for a ten per cent. increase in membership, and this was to be secured within a specified time. How this was done in some churches may be seen by this concrete illustration. A young pastor made the desired pledge and prepared a thermometer graded up to one hundred, which was greatly in excess of his quota, but he was anxious to excel.

He had recorded twenty-five converts upon it when one of the leaders of the movement preached for him. An after meeting was attempted but there was no response. At the close of the service the visiting minister asked a girl of twelve years if she was a Christian. She answered in the negative. He asked her if she desired to become a Christian, and she answered flippantly, "O, I don't know." The minister confessed his embarrassment at the result of his approach and, following the line of least resistance (though former President Harding had truly said, "Following the line of least resistance makes rivers and men crooked") and anxious to end the conversation, he asked if she wished the pastor to pray for her. "He may if he wants to" was her reply.

The pastor was called and after a brief conversation with her went to the thermometer, advanced it one degree and loudly announced, "another enlistment for Kingdom service," although there had been no evidence of penitence or pardon; for these were considered the products of excitement and unworthy of these intellectual times.

In former days men cried with the publican, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." Now they are taught that there is more of the human than of the Divine in the salvation of the soul. Lewis S. Chafer has truly said:

> "There is a vast difference between an individual supplicating God to save him and one supplicating God to help him save himself. The latter is a natural part of the Satanic plan and has no promise of the Divine favor upon it. All such religious exercise, though full of the outward forms and deep sincerity, leaves its moral aspirants doomed, alike with the most degraded, to an everlasting separation and banishment from the presence of God; 'which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgences of the flesh.' Such prayer and religious practice do not really place the saving work in the hands of God, but mockingly ask Him to give His sanction and assistance to that which wholly dishonors and really disregards Him, and which is also both unreasonable and impossible."

And while the work of reformation was substituted for God's plan of regeneration, without which man "cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven," and as there were added to the Church daily men and women who had no inner experience of Salvation, but had pledged themselves to Kingdom service, such as unregenerate persons cannot render, the invisible president shouted aloud for joy.

Chapter VII
The Awakening of the Remnant

Though the plans of the Council of Hades had been carried out successfully for a quarter of a century, it should not be concluded that they had met with no opposition. Even in the darkest days of human history God had not left Himself without witness, and had always preserved a remnant that had never bowed the knee to false gods. It was true in this case, that, while the leaven of unrighteousness was working in the Church, there were a few voices in protest, as emphatic as that of Elijah when he confronted and condemned the troublers in Israel.

There were a few brave soldiers of the Cross, who, by voice and pen, met the attacks of the members of the Council, and exposed them in books and press and could be neither intimidated or purchased. Also a champion of the faith, whom they dared not meet in public debate, stood fearlessly in a great assembly, and by his sincerity, his high

purpose, his profound scholarship and thrilling eloquence succeeded in turning back the tide of infidelity, and secured a much needed rebuke for the members of the Council. His printed messages and his public addresses were unanswerable.

A great statesman, perhaps the most eloquent of American orators, a man of education and piety, came to the defense of the faith, and rallied the Church of God against those within her borders who were denying His Word and dishonoring His Christ. And the greatest evangelist of modern times hurled his anathemas against the despoilers of his faith.

Around these gathered many of the ablest scholars, preachers and educators in the world, who recognized the peril threatening the Church, and arose for its defence.*

The great Bible schools with their magazines, entered their protests, and established institutes where the truth was taught and error refuted; and as intelligent believers became familiar with existing facts, Church papers were discontinued because of their radical tendencies, and Sunday school publications were displaced because of their heretical teachings.

Driven to desperation by the prospect of failure, the members of the Council began a series of attacks upon the scholarship of those who opposed their novel ideas, claimed as new, but actually only revamped forms of moss-grown heresies, long since discarded by the Church; they also strove to convince men that "they were the people and wisdom would die with them." Had it not been so tragic, it would have been amusing to see these "intellectual high-brows"—that is, "men educated beyond their intellects,"—attempt to measure swords with men who had forgotten more than they were capable of learning, and then, when defeated, were so full of egotism, as to call their defeat a victory.

In comparison with the stalwart defenders of "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints" the members of the Council and their satellites looked, to borrow an illustration from a Southern evangelist, "like rat-terriers alongside of elephants," and they were compelled to bark loudly, or their presence would not have been discovered.

*Two intelligent, consecrated Christian laymen bore the expense of the publication of a series of books upon "the Fundamentals," and sent them gratuitously to every pastor, evangelist, missionary, theological professor, theological student, Sunday School superintendent, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. secretary in the English-speaking world, whose address could be obtained.

When they paraded their scholastic degrees as proof of their intellectual superiority, some of their hearers were reminded of an incident that occurred in a town meeting in England where an intelligent young farmer opposed the plan of a member of the House of Lords. His Lordship resented this and said angrily, "You are only a common farmer, and I am a graduate of two universities." To which the undaunted farmer replied, "That's nothing. I have a calf on my farm that sucks two cows, and the more it sucks the bigger calf it becomes."

The awakening of the remnant meant disaster and defeat for the conspirators, and the invisible head of the Council turned trembling away.

Chapter VIII—The End of the Battle

As the members of the Council saw the tide turning against them, and knew that an awakened Church would strip them of their positions of influence, and that they must stand condemned before the world, and be debarred from the treasuries of the Church from which they had drawn their support while seeking its overthrow, they became desperate in their attacks upon all who held firmly the fundamental doctrines of the Bible.

Their assaults were bravely met by men of God, around whom the loyal-hearted were gathering in increasing numbers. A voice from the western sea came ringing across the continent:

"We will not be led into the trap of the deceiver and the snare of the despoiler by such leaders. They must lead toward God or we will refuse to follow them. They have taken down the cross and set up an educational program. They have declared the blood unnecessary. The Church according to such false prophets only needs to be modernized, socialized, programized and financed. Such men cannot deliver us at all. We simply refuse to be delivered.

"God will preserve Him a Church that stands for the old Book in its entirety; that battles for the Deity of Jesus Christ in the completeness of that doctrine, that preaches a salvation of blood, a new birth that is followed by a gracious experience of conscious relation of sonship, of spiritual growth, and Holy Ghost experience; that evangelizes the world in the name of Jesus Christ, driving back false doctrines, and stubbornly standing before every foe that would pull down Golgotha or lessen the meaning of our Lord's victorious coming from the tomb."

The great assembly met. For months the members of the Council had been doubly active in strengthening their lines and coaching their adherents, so that they might control the organization and elect men of their faith, or rather, lack of it.

The hour struck. Was it a Waterloo, or a Gettysburg, or an Armageddon? The struggle was long and intense. One side was inspired and constrained by the love of Christ. The other, as was manifested to the host assembled, by the spirit of the president of the Council. What the latter lacked in argument, was made up in noise, and though they attempted the roar of the lion, their real voice was recognized. The assaults upon the faith were fierce and persistent, but God-inspired men, clad in Heaven's armor, were able, with the shield of faith to "quench all the fiery darts of the wicked," and by skilful use of the sword of the Spirit, "put to flight the armies of the aliens."

The last charge was made and repulsed and the struggle ended, but not as the conspirators had hoped during their many years of propaganda. The Church had found herself. The vote was taken. When the chairman of the assembly said, "As many as believe that the Bible is God's inspired Word and will defend the doctrines of historic Christianity, will please stand," fully ninety per cent. of the audience sprang to their feet, and as they looked around there came to them the realization of the tremendous victory that had been won. Some shouted, some wept with joy, some laughed with holy laughter, some fell back upon their seats overcome by their emotions, when suddenly a strong voice began to sing "Faith of our Fathers, Living Still." The entire congregation of the faithful took up the song, and sang it over again and again, and the expressions of joy continued until the people realized that a new Pentecost had come.

The air without became tremulous with the exultant joy of God's saints and the sound swept through the ether, and surged into countless homes, in radio connection with the great convention. Some realized the extent of the victory, and wept for joy; some praised the Lord; some said it thundered; and as the music of the inspiring battle hymn reached their ears, rising and falling like ocean billows, some said "It is the angels' song," and believed that Heaven's Hallelujah Chorus had again been heard by men. And above all other sounds could be heard the voice of the Divine Christ saying "Upon this rock (My Deity) I will build my Church, and the Council of Hades shall not prevail against it."

And while the apostate teachers, exposed, condemned, defeated, hurried away in shame, the invisible president of the Council fled away, gnashing his teeth in impotent rage.

Dr. G. W. McPherson's Book on the Virgin Birth

By Cromwell Childe, New York, New York

EDITORIAL NOTE.—Although we have already published a commendatory review of Dr. McPherson's new book, "The Modern Mind and the Virgin Birth" (see our review department for the February number), we gladly give space to the following article. It was written by Mr. Cromwell Childe, of New York City. The book is published by Yonkers Book Company, 34 Saint Andrews Place, Yonkers, N. Y. Price $1.00 net.

INTO the nation-wide conflict between the Modernists and the Fundamentalists, which reached white fire in New York some months ago, has come a new protagonist. He is a contestant of particular importance, because he is not a minister, bishop or great layman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but, instead, a chief of the union evangelical work that draws its support from so many denominations. He has sent out, in behalf of the Fundamentalists, a bombshell in the form of a little book that bears the striking, keyed-to-the-moment title, "The Modern Mind and The Virgin Birth."

The book is a calm, clear, dispassionate statement of the conservative position of religion in America today. The New Yorkers who have had the privilege of looking at the proof-sheets are struck with its conciseness, its absolute lack of sentiment or sentimentality. It reads almost like a general's orders to his chiefs of divisions. One by one it takes up what its author styles the "objections" to the Virgin Birth of Christ, and one by one demolishes them.

The man who has written this "document" is already a nationally known figure. He is Dr. George W. McPherson, the president of the Old Union Tent Evangel Summer Tabernacle in New York, that for practically a quarter of a century has flourished, made itself known all over America, and proved of immense religious significance. Voluntary

contributions have supported it. Laymen and ministers of practically every denomination in the country have given it a helping hand. Since its start it has gathered together, at one time or another, more than four million people in every walk of life.

Tent Evangel has brought Dr. McPherson into the thick of the religious movement of today and placed him in contact with the leaders of religious thought on both sides of the Atlantic, to an extent possible to scarcely another man. This knowledge has enabled him to bring to this country many of the greatest pulpit lights and religious orators of the past few years. He is the man who ministers to 200,000 people in New York every summer. He brought over from England Dr. F. B. Meyer, Dr. J. Stewart Holden, Evangelist Gypsy Smith, Charles Forbes Taylor, noted boy preacher, and Professor Graham of Manchester, the famous English pianist, and others of note, and has drawn from America many of the most outstanding preachers and educators.

He was the organizer of the mammoth rallies in Carnegie Hall and the Hippodrome, New York, at which, among other notable men, William Jennings Bryan threw down the gauntlet to "the enemies of the Bible." It was the reading of Dr. McPherson's books that induced Mr. Bryan to take the platform in defense of the Bible against the Modernists and that brought together on the same platform in New York these two champions of the faith. Dr. McPherson, it should be said, is not an enemy but a friend of science, and his books may be viewed as a defense of the Incarnation largely from the standpoint of science.

The book derives further importance from the fact that it is by no means Dr. McPherson's first step in this direction. He has already put out two books on somewhat allied subjects, which have had large circulation and proved enormously popular. Both have put up a strong fight for the position of the Fundamentalists. These books are "The Crisis in Church and College" and "The Modern Conflict over the Bible."

The new book, however, is so much a document of the moment, fitting with unerring aim into the heart of the controversy, that it promises to exert an extraordinary measure of influence.

Although it mentions no names of the present controversialists, with the exception of a brief reference to Dr. Fosdick, the book is a virile straight-from-the-shoulder broadside against Dr. W. N. Guthrie, the news of whose bare-footed classic dancers as part of the services of St. Mark's, New York, has gone all over the country; Dr. Leighton Parks, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick and Dr. Percy Stickney Grant, and a hand of help held out to Bishop William T. Manning, of New York. In this book and in private conversation Dr. McPherson intimates broadly that such a broadside and such help are much needed at the present moment.

"Few people have any idea," he said the other day, handing out a copy of his book to one of the New York reviewers, "how strongly entrenched the Modernists are. What we know as the Modern Movement has grown and increased inconceivably, and let me say, in all denominations. It is a menace to an extent that few realize."

And in the opening page of this book, Dr. McPherson has no hesitation in saying that a hard fight is ahead, and that what must be done at the moment is to re-establish from the foundation the old faith, and to do this it is necessary, first of all, to make certain that the Virgin Birth of Christ shall be believed, since—and he is most definite on this point—this doctrine means the Divinity of Christ. Alongside of this, he rejects the talk of the Modernists of today on the "Living Christ." To him, that is begging the question, that is, placing an abstraction where until today the foundation of the Christian religion has stood.

In good Biblical phrase, Dr. McPherson is "girding his loins" for the fight that is to be. He knows that one is coming. He wants to be in the van of it. He is of the breed of fighting preachers that will stand by their beliefs manfully and will give no quarter. He has written his book with the direct purpose of making it a bomb that will throw two great camps for religious thought in America today into warfare. He does not directly say this in his book, nor does he confess it in conversation with the religious leaders in New York, but that, it can be seen, is the underlying idea of every word he has written down at white heat.

The "Objections" He Demolishes

These are the "Objections" that he has stated frankly in his book, and has followed with the arguments of the Modernists, giving his foes every chance at first, until he demolishes each with a convincing refutation.

"Objection—The story of Christ's birth, as related by Matthew and Luke, is an inter-

polation, *i.e.*, something that was added to these Gospels centuries after they had been written."

"*Objection*—The two stories of the Virgin Birth, as given by Matthew and Luke, including their genealogical records, are contradictory."

"*Objection*—If Jesus had a miraculous human origin he would not have concealed so momentous a fact from his disciples."

"*Objection*—If Jesus Christ had been Virgin born, John and Paul, who wrote most of the New Testament, would not have been silent regarding it."

"*Objection*—The disciples of Jesus held two traditions regarding him—one that he was the son of God, the other that he was the son of Joseph; and since his disciples differed as to this matter, why should men concern themselves over it."

"*Objectio*—The story of the Virgin Birth was suggested to Christ's disciples by the old pagan myths of the gods becoming incarnate in men, and is simply a poetic description of the greatness of Jesus."

"*Objection*—In calling himself the 'Son of Man' did not Jesus Christ virtually deny the story of his Virgin Birth?"

"There are those," Dr. McPherson writes, "who insist that thoughtful men can no longer hold to the faith of our fathers, and that Christianty must be restated in new terms that are in harmony with modern science and acceptable to 'modern men,' even though it be at the cost of the rejection of those old cherished Bible doctrines, which for nineteen hundred years Christian people have believed and loved, which doctrines, they say, we must cast aside, as we would a worn-out garment, and accept in their place the vague, indefinite and everchanging postulates and conclusion of science and philosophy."

Having thus stated the position of his foes, he sends out from New York the ringing challenge to hold to the faith, with this slogan: "It is obvious that science does not and cannot consistently deny the Virgin Birth of Christ."

Religion in Reach

By Lawrence Keister, D.D., Scottdale, Pennsylvania

Our Part of Pentecost

IF EVER a man was inspired Peter certainly was on the day of Pentecost. He was one of the hundred and twenty who were filled with the Spirit, upon whom the visible token rested, whose speech exhibited superior wisdom and their conduct superior courage. Peter's address is recorded and even at the present day, so distant and so different, it reveals the thought of God and the power of God.

The audience assembled on that occasion was composed of disciples of Jesus and their sympathizers on the one hand, and on the other the extremists who rejected Jesus and the people whom they incited to clamor for his crucifixion. The speaker took account of all his hearers, the friends and the enemies of Jesus, and then widened the scope of his interest as he developed the full meaning of his inspired proclamation. By divine intention his address reaches us, being edited, recorded and preserved by the Spirit, for we have our part in Pentecost which is the perpetual intake of spiritual life and power.

"This Jesus did God raise up", after his crucifixion and burial, after his apparent defeat, "of whom we all are witnesses". We have first hand knowledge of the resurrection of Jesus as a historic fact, but we are witnesses especially of the risen Christ whom we have seen and with whom we have conversed after his passion. Such was the position of these first Christians and such their privilege and responsibility. Christians of the present time cannot know by personal observation the fact of the resurrection but they can know the risen Christ in their own personal experience and therefore are competent as his witnesses. They know Christ as living and present. This is their religion as a personal experience and as a testimony they offer to others.

The key to life and service is placed in our hands. "To you is the promise" of the Spirit, "and to your children and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call." It is not the promise of a holy land, but a holy life. It is God's estimate of our real need, his provision for our well-being, his way of preparing us for effective service. It is a spiritual heritage to be handed down to succeeding generations. It extends far and wide even to all who hear and heed the call of God. It is religion as God thinks of religion, religion in terms of our need and our

capacity. And so Christians today have part in Pentecost as well as in the teaching of Jesus, his example and his atonement.

As Christians we are recipients of the Spirit and witnesses of the risen Christ, this is our part of Pentecost. The promise of the Spirit is the Spirit himself for this promise is for present fulfillment. Pentecost is perpetual if we will have it so, for its essentials are always ours according to the promise. Not the tongues of fire, not the sound of the rushing of a mighty wind, not the power to speak in languages other than our own—these are not given in this age which exalts the external and spectacular. But how fittingly these supernatural manifestations prefaced the address of Peter, prepared the minds of men for a reversal of human judgement, contributed to the conviction of sinners unaccustomed to contrition and led to the declaration of the truth as God knows it and as he reveals it to men who want to know.

But perhaps we are interested in advanced theology rather than advanced religion. Perhaps the discussion of doctrine is our penchant rather than the appropriation of truth. We may confine ourselves to the gospels and show no desire to enter the Acts. We may even ask whether it is necessary to know Christ as he now is, the risen, living Christ, in order to be saved. Is the sight of the cross not sufficient? Not the crucifix but the living Christ saves us. Let no symbol of his suffering rob us of his presence, his power to forgive sin and to renew us in righteousness. We require the Holy Spirit for our regeneration and also as the companion of our life, as the One who introduces us to the great family of God beginning in our own little group and extending to all believers in all nations and ages and thus including that inspired company gathered in one place with one accord on the day of Pentecost. Without this introduction we could not be quite comfortable in the kingdom of God.

In the presence of Christ and assisted by the Spirit believers discover believers. They know each other here. Wherever our Lord enters there is a dissolving of doubts and a composing of differences, a disappearing of divisions and an adjustment of controversies. Christianity means co-operation with Christ. Then why should Christians continue to emphasize their differences and not rather their unity through the Spirit? Why exalt the temporal when the spiritual opens into the better things and into the richer relations of life? Jesus esteems the one who does the will of his Father as his brother and sister and mother, gathering in one the closest family ties to represent the Christian's relation to himself and as we infer the relation of each Christian to all who make up this group.

We are called Christians because we are followers of Christ but we know we often hesitate and even fail to follow him. We are called believers because we believe in Christ, but we know that we are slow of heart to believe in him and that again and again our faith proves weak and limited. Our faith shows stress and strain. Sometimes Christ seems to be more than we require in our ordinary life if not more than we need in our emergencies. But he knows our psychology. "If a man love me he will keep my word." Our obedience is the test and also the measure of our devotion, the index on the dial being in full view.

Not time, not space, not adverse circumstances separate us from God. They have no such power. Sin separates, sin which shows us to be disobedient, selfish, defiant. Happy is the man who loves the living Christ. Happy the man in whom the Spirit finds no resistance. Happy the man who walks in the sunshine of the divine presence. Men covet happiness, they seek it, they try to manufacture it. Let them look for it in the Bible and discover it among the beatitudes. Let them search for it in the gospels and pursue it in the Acts. Let them enter the company that gathers around the risen Christ and assure themselves that it abounds there. Let them learn that the Holy Spirit is the gift of God and that it is he who relieves the listlessness of life and the loneliness of the soul by bestowing hope and realization, promise and fulfillment day by day through our years.

Peter expressed the thought of God and the will of God when he placed the emphasis on the risen Christ and the Holy Spirit as the two-fold source of the vitality and energy of the Christian and the Church. He makes room for us in the divine plan and gives us a place on the divine program. We are not overlooked, we are not left out—not by his intention—and if we are by our own choice it is because we have judged ourselves unworthy of these high privileges and holy associations. Entering the divine plan means increase of spiritual life and efficiency; the acceptance of Pentecost as the perpetual intake of energy for the individual Christian and the Church as a whole; the settled purpose to be inspired by the Holy Spirit and enabled to express the thought of God and the will of God in lives consecrated to him.

A Bit of Half Century-Old History With a Present Day Application

By A Contemporary

IN the class of '64, Hamilton College, was graduated one of the most brilliant writers and speakers that that institution—pre-eminent for its literary and oratorical product — ever sent forth. His scholarship was attested by the fact that he stood only second in a class of which Elihu Root was valedictorian. We will designate him as H. M. S.

After a year of newspaper work he entered with the class of '68 into the Auburn Theological Seminary to prepare for the Presbyterian ministry. In that class was a '65 Hamilton College man whom we will designate D. W. B. S and B were members of the Alpha Delta Phi fraternity, and in the seminary naturally they continued their college intimacy.

Mr. S was always perfect in his seminary recitations, but unfortunately he had an infirmity of hearing which kept him from entering into the class discussions, so that none, unless it was his intimate, B, knew where he really stood upon questions at issue.

Upon his graduation, he was called to the pastorate of the Salina Presbyterian Church in Syracuse, N. Y. In due time the Syracuse Presbytery held a meeting in his church for his ordination and installation. B had become pastor of a church in that presbytery. The presbyterial Examining Committee conducted the examination for ordination, which did not seem altogether satisfactory. B saw that the Committee was using crucial words in one sense while S was using them in a different sense. It was apparent, however, that the Committee would pass him. Following the usual custom, after the committee work was done, the matter was thrown open for any member of presbytery, who desired to do so, to question the candidate.

B was one of the most lovable and loyal men that ever lived. But just then his love and loyalty came to a wrenching crisis. Should fraternity friendship and personal affection for his winsome classmate prevail over his love for his Lord and Master, and loyalty to His Church? The question was quickly decided. Rising from his seat near the rear of the room he walked down the aisle to the front and said, "I would like to ask my brother a few questions." Here is the quiz:

1. "We read in 2 Timothy iii. 16, that 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.' Do you believe that the Bible is inspired in any other sense than the works of genius—for instance those of Shakespeare, Milton Goethe—are inspired?" After some embarrassment, he replied that he did not.

2. "We read in Romans ix. 5 of 'the fathers, of whom Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.' Do you believe that Christ is God?" Again embarrassment and a negative answer.

3. "We read that at the institution of the Lord's Supper Jesus took the cup and said, Matthew xxvi. 28, 'This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' Do you believe there is any connection between the shedding of Christ's blood and the forgiveness of sins on the part of God?" Embarrassment, confusion, and a negative answer.

B quietly turned and took his seat. Bible, deity of Christ, atonement, gone! It was as though a bombshell had been dropped there. Presbytery adjourned until nine o'clock next morning. It is said that S walked the streets of Syracuse alone all that night.

The next morning S appeared before Presbytery and said: "It is plain from what transpired last evening that I have rightfully no place in the Presbyterian Church. I beg leave to resign my license into your hands, and ask that my name be erased from your roll." And he added, "Perhaps I should say that in my ministry in this church, I have never uttered a word contrary to Presbyterian doctrine. If there has been any defect in my preaching, it has been in what I did not rather than in what I did say."

In his outgoing, S carried with him the respect and affection of all who knew him, for he had the manliness and courage to do the honorable, honest, and morally decent thing that befitted the situation into which he had come. For him to have continued, by some hook or crook, in the Presbyterian ministry, would have been neither honorable, honest, nor morally decent. *Henry Martyn* S was too much of a man for that. He went over to the Unitarians and continued in that ministry until his death in 1905.

The application of the foregoing incident

to the present time and situation is obvious.

Every person who does not believe in the unique, divine inspiration of the Bible; who denies the deity of Christ, which he does if he rejects the Virgin Birth, hoodwink, shuffle, evade, camouflage as he may, for as presented in Scripture the two are inextricably and indissolubly connected together; who denies the substitutionary atonement of Jesus on Calvary;—every such person should do the honorable, honest, morally decent thing of voluntarily separating himself from the Orthodox Church.

What was befitting in 1868 is no less befitting in 1924.

The Truth of God Versus the Wisdom of this World

THE infidelities of men in high places as teachers and preachers and lecturers, on so-called liberal platforms, are affecting the common people of our churches far less than we sometimes think. There has always been a deluge of infidelity, impudent and insolent, insidious and calculating, but it has only reached a certain proportion of the people. The great mass of the people have held on to the Bible as God's Word, and will hold on to it, and all the philosophical and scientific infidelities of would-be deceivers and misleaders do not succeed in moving them from the simplicity of their faith. And whenever this simplicity of faith is appealed to, by evangelical preachers, they find that it is a constant element in the life of the people. Let the work of the Church be done in this assurance, for herein is comfort when our hearts are saddened by false teachers; and herein is power, when we strive to do God's work.

The great heresies and infidelities are, and commonly have been, among those who have prided themselves with self-conceit, on their culture and learning, their philosophy and worldly wisdom. Thus it was, in the time of Paul, that "the world by wisdom knew not God," and that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" were the called humble and believing followers of Jesus Christ. The fact then was as the fact is now, that God hath chosen those whom the world calls foolish to confound those who conceitedly think themselves wise and in possession of "new knowledge"; and he has chosen those whom the conceitedly great and mighty of the world consider weak, to confound these very mighty ones; and even those who are despised, God has chosen to bring to nought the infidel schemes of the men who call themselves scholarly and cultured.

There is a revolt just now on the part of certain professors in the great universities, and some of the teachers in some of the wealthy and largely-endowed theological seminaries in some or the great cities, and some of the preachers in large city churches. They are applauding themselves and one another on their great learning and philosophy and culture. They are denying the deity, and the Virgin Birth and the sacrificial atonement of Jesus Christ; they are ignoring the facts of sin and of eternal punishment; they are sneering at the inspiration of the Scriptures; they are taking ground held by Unitarians and Universalists, and are advocating and furthering schemes for fellowship with these and other bodies which are distinctly and avowedly at variance with what is evangelical.

All of this is very distressing, were it not that they are setting themselves in opposition to God as revealed in his inspired Word. They are not teaching what the Scriptures teach, but are using their vaunted scholarship to show how they can set aside the plain teachings of the Bible. In this they are not only defying God himself, but are ignoring the plain understanding and simple faith of the plain people, who take God at his Word, and who believe what is taught in the Bible.

In some way or other the Bible has a hold on the minds of the common people that infidels and rationalistic professors are not able to break and have not been able to break. Forever God's Word stands in heaven and forever it will stand on earth. Those who count on Unitarianizing the Presbyterian and other evangelical churches are counting without their host. These rationalists will leave their frothing infidel lectures and sermons with the dead oppositions of Celsus and Voltaire and Paine, and the Bible will go on to win fresh triumphs in the hearts of the uncounted millions of true believers, who are willing to be saved as sinners by the grace of God, and are

ready to take God at his Word as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

Those who believe in Jesus Christ need not be too greatly alarmed. They are to repel attacks. They are to answer and to overcome error as far as they can. But they are to remember that God reigns, and that his Holy Spirit blesses the truth as it is preached to those who believe the Word of God in simplicity and truth.—*Herald and Presbyter.*

Bibles or Libels?

By G. B. F. Hallock, D.D., Rochester, New York

THE professed Christian is the only Bible the average American sinner will read, and the question is, What sort of doctrine or precept is he learning from your life? That unconverted neighbor of yours is reading a chapter from your thoughts every day, for "as a man thinketh, so is he"; what is your neighbor's conclusion as to your thoughts, by what he sees of you particularly?

That person under your own roof, whether close relative or friendly visitor, is judging your life-Scripture by the spirit you show and the words you speak. What is his verdict likely to be of yourself, as a walking Bible?

There is wonderful power in a witnessing life. A zealous, if not over-tactful, street missionary once asked a city Arab, "Do you know Jesus?" "No, I don't know Jesus," was the reply; "but I know a friend of his, and I like her." Some good woman had done more than she knew for that boy, by a witnessing life.

There is even such a thing as a witnessing face. From his own experience Dr. G. Campbell Morgan told of a Yorkshire factory girl who had given herself to Christ. "As she was walking up and down the platform of a railway station, waiting for a train, her face became transfigured with the new joy. In a first-class carriage sat a lady of title, wealth and culture. She saw the girl pass several times in front of the train, called to her and asked, 'What makes you look so happy?' The girl told her simple story, and the result of the brief conversation was that this lady was led to the same Christ. I knew both women, and can testify to the truth of the incident."

And there is also such a thing as a witnessing presence, a witnessing appearance. It is close akin to the witnessing face. General William Booth, in the early days of the Salvation Army, wrote: "About a month ago, one of our people, who had herself been a drunkard, was standing at one of the open-air services on the waste, when she observed a woman who had formerly been one of her bad companions, suddenly leave the crowd and walk quickly away. Hurrying after her, she found this poor drunkard in great distress about her soul. 'Oh!' she said, 'I listened to the speakers, but when I saw you standing there so wonderfully changed from what you used to be, I could stand it no longer.' She was induced, however, to return to the meeting, and then to attend the service in the hall, where she found salvation. She is now another living witness of the power of Christ to save the drunkard. May God preserve her faithful unto death!"

The Psalmist made a quite wonderful statement once: "They that fear thee will be glad when they see me; because I have hoped in thy Word."

A brick manufacturer, who is a very substantial man, advertised for a boy. A boy appeared, and he was running over with questions. "How much wages do you pay?" was the first question. "Five dollars a week and board," was the reply. "What kind of board?" said the sharp applicant for a position. "Well," said the corpulent and good-natured manufacturer, "I eat it." "Give me the job," said the boy, with a smiling glance at his prospective employer. The brick manufacturer was a good advertisement of the food that he gave his workmen. If you and I should ask some one to become a Christian, would he look at the Gospel's results in our lives and say, "I want it?"

The living Bible, the "sermon in shoes" that is not a libel, is Christianity's best defense. When Ole Bull, the great Norwegian violinist, was in this country he was assailed by much hostile criticism. Mr. James Gordon Bennett offered him the columns of the New York Herald to reply to his traducers. In broken English he thanked the editor, saying, "I tink, Mr. Bennett, it is best tey writes against me, and I play against tem."

True Christian living is the best defense against critics of Christianity. But it is more than defence. It is active propaganda of the Gospel.—*Herald and Presbyter.*

THE SANCTUARY

The Witness of the Spirit

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

Rom. viii. 16, *"The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."*

1 *John v.* 10, *"He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself."*

A WOMAN said to a clergyman: "I am in great distress of mind, and I think may be you can help me." He inquired what the matter was. She replied: "Oh, I don't know. I have been a professing Christian many years, but I have never been happy. I have tried always to do my duty; have been regular in my private devotion, reading the Bible and prayer; have never intentionally neglected any duty or done that which I knew to be wrong. I do not mean that I have been perfect—far from it, for I realize every day how far I come short; but I never had any joy in my Christian life—the joys of salvation which you preach. Your sermons make me miserable. I am trusting Christ—I have no one else to trust; but I am so unhappy. I have no joy, and I never had any; and I feel that I must have the witness of the Spirit or I cannot be a Christian."

A while ago I had a talk with a Christian of perhaps twenty-five years standing, and she said: "This matter of 'the witness of the Spirit' has troubled me greatly, for I do not know that I ever had it, and I come to think that may be I have been expecting too much, or not expecting the right thing, or expecting it in a wrong way."

Among a certain class of our brethren I have heard expressions such as these: "I have the witness of the Spirit to-night that I am a child of God;" "The Spirit witnesses with my spirit that Jesus sweetly saves me now;" "Glory is in my soul, for I feel that the Spirit possesses me wholly: I go in for full salvation." A common method of salutation among them used to be "Have you the witness of the Spirit to-day?"

Many who have heard such language and have seen that it implied something that they themselves did not seem to possess, have been troubled; and I doubt not that thereby many a true child of God has come to discredit the genuineness of his own Christian experience.

These difficulties I have felt in common with you—keenly felt them, and I have found my way out of them; and it may be that if I can throw relieving light upon this subject, I shall perform a grateful office to you.

What I have to present is the result of (1) careful Bible study, (2) reading such literature upon the subject as has come in my way, and (3) talk with others. In immediate preparation for this discourse, I had a conversation with a Congregational clergyman who is cultured in human schools and in God's school. I said to him, "Tell me all you know about the witness of the Spirit." A careful discussion of the subject followed. I had a talk with an able Methodist minister who has been in the ministry perhaps forty years, and has frequently been theological examiner in his Conference. I had an interview with a precious little saint who seems to me to have as close an intimacy with God as any one I ever knew. Of course I tested what was said by the Scriptures, but as we all adhered pretty closely to our Bibles, we all seemed to have about the same understanding of the matter.

With these premisings, I have a word of warning, caution, request to make, which is, that you do not seek to run your religious experience in any one else's mould, but only in the mould of the Divine Word. "To the law and to the testimony."

The Holy Spirit the Witness

It may be helpful to know that our English word "witness," which is both a noun and a verb, translates in the New Testament the three Greek nouns *martur, marturia, marturion,* and the two Greek verbs *martureō* and *marturomai.* Furthermore, these three Greek nouns are translated by the five English words *martyr, record, report, testimony,* and *witness;* while the two Greek verbs are thus translated: to *charge,* to *bear record,* to *report,* to *testify,* to *give testimony,* to *witness,* and to *bear witness.* Thus you see what areas

and complexions of meaning are in these New Testament Greek words which are translated "witness."

Look at the word witness, itself. It may mean 1. One who testifies—he is a witness; or 2. That which he testifies—his testimony: that is witness; or 3. His act of testifying, which is witnessing, or witness. There is, then, 1. The testifier, the person; 2. The testimony, what he says; and 3. The testifying, his act. Accordingly, when we speak of the witness of the Spirit, we may mean either 1. The Spirit himself who testifies; or 2. The testimony which he gives; or 3. His act of testifying. This seems very simple and plain when once it is stated, does it not? And I think that if in the text you would substitute the word testimony for the word witness, as you are clearly entitled to do, you would do much to take the subject out of the realm of mist and indeterminateness. The Holy Spirit *testifies* to our spirit that we are the children of God.

The Method of the Holy Spirit's Witness

The Spirit being the testifier, a most important question at once arises: How does He testify? Upon the right answer to this question will very much depend what we troubled ones wish to know, and the relief which we wish to obtain.

A good many are led to think that in some way a mysterious impact should be made by the Holy Spirit; that a sort of celestial shock should be given, by which some peculiar and distinguishing sensation will be produced that will be a certification to them that they are the children of God. They suppose that in some unaccountable manner the Spirit excites happy emotions in the breast, so that if they feel good, He is bearing witness with their spirit, and if they do not feel good, He is not bearing witness. I think this is a fair statement of the case.

Dear friends, just let us use our common sense now. Is it any such way you would expect me to testify if you were to ask my testimony concerning a question of fact? Remember that a witness is one who testifies, and he witnesses by telling what he knows. Our judge, suppose, is holding court. You are called upon as a witness to clear the prisoner at the bar whom you know to be innocent. You go before the jury, and you violently shake the foreman, and you hug the next one, and so on in turn, you all the time not speaking a word or making an intelligible sign. The judge asks what you are doing. You reply, "Oh, I am trying to make the jurors *feel* that the prisoner is innocent." The court would probably take measures to send you to an asylum for the insane. To convince the jury that the prisoner is innocent, you must simply testify to the facts that prove his innocence. They do not want any impact or shock from your hands to feel *you*: they only want to know your testimony.

Now you say to me, "Pastor, is that the principle that we are to apply to the Holy Spirit's witness?" I answer, "Yes, precisely so." But you say, "We read in 1 John v. 10, that the believer hath the witness *in himself.*" Certainly; where else would you have it? When a jury listens to a credible witness, they have his testimony in themselves, and when they retire to their room to deliberate, they render their verdict according to what they believe of the testimony, or witness, which they have in their minds,—in themselves. The Holy Spirit's witness is not inspiration, it is not revelation, it is not feeling: it is testimony. How many there are who are trying to find the Spirit himself instead of his testimony. My dear Christian, if you have been trying to realize to yourself the Spirit's personal sensible presence instead of hearing or receiving his witness, you have been trying an impossible thing; and you may be sure that when you are occupying yourself thus, His witness is not being heard. The juror should attend to the witness' testimony and not to his person.

Still you ask: "What are we to do with the glowing accounts of Christian rapture which we hear of,—for instance with the case of the man who said, 'I feel, I feel, I feel like the morning star'?" Do? I know not that we have anything to do, except it be to be thankful that he felt so well. But I must ask, What has this to do with the witness of the Spirit? I suppose you know there is such a thing as fashion in religion. A particular style of religious exercise may be popular in a community, or in a communion, and those who want it can have it by taking the requisite means to secure it. But let us refer to the jury again. Suppose one of the twelve should work himself up into a state of mental ecstasy; or suppose undue inward heat should throw him into violent perspiration; or suppose the testimony itself of the witness should wonderfully exalt or wonderfully depress his feelings: would that make any difference with the fact, or with the truthfulness, of the witness' testimony? None at all. As one of the

clergymen whom I talked with said: "When some of my people talk that way, they simply do not know what they are talking about: they have mistaken emotion for the Spirit's witness."

Yet further in regard to the method of the Spirit's witness. I am taught that we are never conscious of His operations. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John iii. 8). Wind is air in motion. We are never conscious of the viewless air itself, though in it we live and move and have our being, but conscious of its effects. We do not see the wind, but we see and feel the effects which it produces. Just so, while never conscious of the Spirit himself, we are conscious of the effects which he produces.

But says one: "I can tell the exact time when I was converted. I was conscious of that." True. But listen: "Except a man be born again"—Greek "be begotten from above," i.e. by the Holy Spirit. Regeneration is the Holy Spirit's work of begetting,—of communicating spiritual being. Were you conscious when you were begotten physically? No more were you conscious when you were begotten spiritually. That was below consciousness. When that divinely communicated life works itself up into consciousness, when you act its act, that is what you are conscious of. That first consciousness is the conversion of which you speak. You became conscious not of the Holy Spirit himself, but of the effect which he produced. Where there is regeneration, the conversion is a true one. I doubt not there are many conversions, so called, where there is no regeneration: those are spurious. When I got hold of this *fact of unconsciousness of the Spirit's operations, and consciousness of only the effects thereof,* it was like a sudden sunrise in its illumination. I was like a mariner out upon the sea catching sight of a lofty headland: navigation was no longer uncertain. And you know we are never conscious of our physical life,—only of its effects. In this respect at least, the analogy between physical and spiritual life is complete.

Still farther in regard to the method of the Spirit's witness. I am taught that He witnesses only in, with, by the Word, or truth of God. If this be so, then all looking for mysterious impacts, celestial shocks, supernatural tokens, as witness, is futile.

Said Jesus, "When he, the Spirit of truth is come . . . he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. . . . He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you" (John xvi.).

"He shall not speak of himself." He was to keep himself in the background. He was to speak what the Father and the Son gave him to speak. This he has done in the Sacred Word. Now-a-days we have court reporters: they take down what the witness says, and long after he has left the stand his testimony, or witness, is read. The testimony, or witness, of the Holy Spirit has been taken down by apostolic and evangelistic reporters. Here in the Book we have it. If we accept, believe, act upon the Word of God, we have received the testimony, witness, of the Spirit. If we reject it, we reject his witness. But there is this difference between the Holy Spirit's testimony and that of the witness in court. The witness in court goes away and leaves his testimony when once it is given, but the Holy Spirit remains with and in his testimony. Hence it is, as we read in Hebrews iv. 12, that "the word of God is quick and powerful [Rev. living and active], and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." He sends his testimony home to the heart and conscience of the hearer or reader, but always in accordance with the laws of the human mind which he himself as God has instituted.

Thus, as to the method of the Spirit's witness, we see that it is 1. Not in any impactive, tactual, emotional way, but is by testimony; 2. Unconscious; 3. By and only by the Word.

The Testimony or Witness of the Holy Spirit

Having considered the Holy Spirit as testifier and the method of his testifying, let us now consider His testimony, or witness. The specific thing that we are after in this discourse is his testimony, or witness, that we are the children of God.

I ask you to specially note the fact just here, that the Spirit's testimony, like that of the witness in court, is only to what is already a fact. The testimony does not create the fact; it only enounces what is already true. If the prisoner at the bar is innocent, it is not the witness' testimony that makes him so: he is innocent before that, and the testimony is only confirmation, proof, of innocence. So, when the distressed woman said,

"I feel that I must have the witness of the Spirit or I cannot be a Christian," she had unfortunately confused herself with the notion that somehow it was the witness of the Spirit that made her a Christian, whereas it could only attest the fact that she was already one. If she were a Christian, she was so, witness or no witness.

You ask, "Well, then, how do we get His witness that we are the children of God?"

While I was talking with the Congregational brother, he went to his study and brought that fascinating book, the Life of James Hannington, a Church-of-England man, and first Bishop of Eastern Equatorial Africa, who with such splendid heroism did his work and met such a tragic death at the murderous hands of the dusky sons of that far off land. While yet a rector in England, a younger brother went to hear him preach, who writes thus:

"I came down from Brighton one Sunday to hear my brother James preach. I was in much doubt and distress of mind. One remark in my brother's sermon made a deep impression upon me, and threw light into my soul. It was as follows: 'The fact of our salvation does not depend upon our feelings. As for myself, there are times when, if I consulted my feelings, I should say that I am not saved. I should be plunged again into the depths of misery. Feelings are treacherous things. After a sermon which has met our own case we may have experienced a time of peace; or our circumstances may have induced a happy frame of mind: we are then quite assured of God's love. Depression of spirits follows, and we quickly lose our hope. But as surely as we rest upon these frauds, our feelings, the Lord will see fit to withdraw them that we may learn to rest upon Him. I find that as soon as we go back and stand upon His bare Word, I recover my joy and peace. Therefore, let me urge upon you the necessity of staying your faith upon Christ: not upon your most hallowed feelings, but upon Christ himself and his written promises. Whenever you are in doubt, perplexed, and unhappy, go at once to the Lord; fix your mind upon some precious passage from his unfailing Word, and God's truth will disperse any mists of darkness which Satan's lies may have brought upon your soul.'" And the visiting brother goes on to say, "From these words I received much help, as I had for a long time fancied that when I felt happy after prayer, or reading my Bible, or hearing some sermon, I was all right, but in a very little while all these happy feelings fled away and left me more wretched than ever. A short time after this my attention was directed by the Hon. T. Pelham to St. John iii. 16, 'He that believeth *hath* everlasting life,' and the Holy Ghost opened my eyes in a moment, and I saw the truth of my dear brother's words, and have been enabled to rest from that day upon the Word as a rock that cannot be shaken" (pp. 145-6).

You get the Holy Spirit's testimony, witness, by accepting the testimony which he has given. He was to take the things of Christ and show them unto men, and so he saith, "He that believeth the Son *hath* everlasting life." Do you believe on the Son? If you accept the Spirit's testimony concerning belief on the Son of God, then you have his testimony that you have everlasting life. Again he says: "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on His name" (Jno. i. 12). Have you received Christ? Then you have the Holy Ghost's testimony that you are a son of God. Two verses before our text from Romans, he says: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (viii. 14). Are you led by the Spirit of God? He may be attempting to lead you, and you may be pulling back, not following. But if you *are led* by Him, then you have his testimony that you are a child of God. Do you accept it? If so, you have the witness of the Spirit. He is in and with the Word, and so when he can, when the facts in our case will permit, he works in our spirits the comfortable persuasion, the assurance of sonship. We have the witness within. Says St. John, "These things have I written unto you that believe, that ye may know that ye have eternal life" (1 Jno. v. 13). The *knowing* and *believing* that we have eternal life on the testimony of the Word not on the testimony of our feelings, is having the witness in ourselves.

It is at this point that the joys of salvation come in.

> "Blessed assurance, Jesus is mine!
> O what a foretaste of glory divine!"

The distressed woman found it so. She said: "I see it now. O blessed Lord Jesus, I take *Thee* on Thy Word, and will henceforth trust Thee and serve Thee with all my heart. I thank Thee for taking me out of this cloud and darkness in which I have been so long." And she went forth happy, not in her feelings but in her Saviour; joyful not in what she

experienced, but in what she possessed in Christ. The Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirits, not by turning our thoughts within to watch our changeful feelings, but by turning our thoughts without, to rest upon his own assurances in his own inspired Scriptures of truth. Just in proportion, therefore, as we lose sight of self and receive as true the testimony of the Spirit with regard to the efficacy of Christ's finished work, will his witness-bearing be to us a source of joy in the Lord, of conscious acceptance in the Beloved.

I suspect, indeed I know, that why so many have not the witness of the Spirit is because they have silenced him. Do you see, if we are walking in disobedience to the Word which the Divine Spirit has given for walk, how we can have the same Divine Spirit's certification of our Christian character? If being led by the Spirit of God is proof that we are children of God, can the Spirit work in us the comfortable persuasion, the joyful assurance, of a filial state, if we are not in fact led?

I am trying to give you here, from Sabbath to Sabbath—(and perhaps more than you are able comfortably to bear)—the testimony of the Divine Word. You will bear me witness that I am *not* giving you my opinions, my speculations, my "latest thought," as apart from or contrary to the Bible, as so many are doing in these days. God forbid. What right have I, has any man, set of God to "preach the Word," to hold thoughts, much more to emit such thoughts, that deny His Word? Oh, Holy Spirit, seal my lips in eternal silence if I—while always welcoming *truth* from whatever source—ever under the obsession of the so-called new knowledge give the lie to God, and commit the monstrous mendacity of denying what I say I believe so long as I am under the sacred avowal that I "sincerely believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The Holy Spirit is trying to lead us as a people, by His Word, in the way of Christian peace, joy, service. We have been taught of our glorious standing and our precious privilege in Christ our adorable Saviour and Lord. He is teaching us of our duty,—and our duties, when our hearts are right towards them, are privileges. We have had his testimony as to our duty in testimony, i.e. in confessing Christ, both by baptism, by voice, and by life. We have had his testimony as to our duty in service,—in the world-wide extension of Christ's cause; in loyalty and steadfastness in covenant obligations and work for home interests; in walking in separation from the world. Most clearly have we had the Holy Ghost's testimony as to our duty in the matter of beneficence; and in much else. It may be that in some of these things professed Christians have met a crisis, a testing. It may be that some have gone down under it, but I sincerely hope not. However, beloved, I can tell you this: if you or I put away one jot or tittle of God's Word which the Holy Spirit applies to us, we do it at our peril. How, under such circumstances, can we have the witness of the Spirit?

It would not be strange if more than one were just now saying: "I haven't the witness of the Spirit. I have, instead, conviction of sin by the Spirit. By this hour's message He is testifying against *me*: He is showing me my dereliction, how I refused to be led by Him, how I have grieved, quenched Him. I am under condemnation. God forgive me."

Listen to His testimony again: "Whoso confesseth and forsaketh his sin shall have mercy" (Prov. xxviii. 13). And still again: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins" (1 Jno. i. 9). Here is your hope, here is my hope, in every time of wandering, of unfaithfulness, of failure, of sin. And here is the Spirit's witness as to restoration when fellowship has been broken or impaired.

Oh! the joy, the blessedness, of walking in unhindered fellowship with God through the Spirit.

"The Spirit leads us on
To perfect faith and love,
To perfect hope, and peace, and trust,
For earth and heaven above.

"'Tis He who does confirm
The blessed work within,
By adding grace to welcomed grace,
Where reigned the power of sin.

"And He the witness gives
To loyal hearts and free,
That every promise is fulfilled
If faith but brings the plea."
(*Hartsough*)

"We by the Spirit prove,
And know the things of God,—
The things which freely of His love
He hath on us bestowed.

"His Spirit which He gave,
Now dwells in us we know;
The witness in ourselves we have,
And all its fruits we show.

"Our nature's turned, our mind
Transformed with all its powers;

"And both the witnesses are joined,—
Thy Spirit, Lord, with ours."
(*Charles Wesley*)

As many as are led by the Spirit of God re the sons of God. For such have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but have received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, "Abba, Father," the Spirit Himself bearing witness with their spirit that they are the children of God; and if children, then heirs: heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.

FLASHLIGHTS

By Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware

KEEPING YOUNG—They shall still bring forth fruit in old age.—Psalms 92:14.

I wonder if Mrs. Humphry Ward is quite ight in a word she has used of Mr. Stopford Brooke. It is found in her recently published eminiscences of a very crowded life. She says hat Stopford Brooke's old age was "a triumph n the most difficult of arts. He was young to he very end. He knew what to give up and vhat to keep, and his freshness of feeling ıever failed." I am wondering if the word 'art" gives the right interpretation. The vord "arts" seems to suggest too much effort, too much careful purpose, too much nxious design, to explain something which ought to be very natural. One sometimes ıears of people who are "trying to keep oung," and their efforts are frequently not a ittle pitiful. They force themselves to go ıere and there, and constrain themselves into his and that mood, and they usually get very veary in their endeavors, and the wrinkles gather about their spirits as they have already gathered around their brows. Their efforts ıre too mechanical. It is something like a table fountain I once saw in a friend's dining-oom. The waters were leaping and dancing ike strong springs in the heather; but alas! I could hear the click of the machinery. There was too much art, and too little nature and ife.

I like the Scriptural word better than Mrs. Ward's; "They shall bring forth fruit in old age." That takes us from art to nature, from the machinery into the garden. The beautiful growths are natural and spontaneous. They are the inevitable issues of certain deep and vital relationships. "They that be planted in the house of the Lord . . . shall bring forth fruit in old age." A certain rootage is to result in certain fruitage. We are to abide in a certain soil and the fruit is sure. "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." And the fruit does not become more meager as the years increase. That is one of the marvelous surprises of renewing grace; the spiritual fertility is maintained to the end of the days.

But there is even more than this. "His leaf also shall not wither." That seems to suggest an antidote to the withering influence of the years. Even the leaf is to keep green. It is not to become sere and yellow. And the leaf is the early thing, the first thing, the thing of the springtime. "The tender years of hope!" These are to be upon the tree at seventy as they were at twenty. At autumn-time his spirit is to be bright with the promise of the spring.

If there is any art at all it consists in just burying one's roots in the Lord. If we are rooted and grounded in him, the increasing years will have no terror. We shall face them with the alertness of children, and we shall greet the unseen with a cheer.

THE UNSELFISH GOD—For he shall not speak of himself."—John 16:13.

One of the characteristics of a selfish soul is the inclination to speak of himself immoderately, if not exclusively. The great model of unselfishness is God. The Old Testament is full of the unfolding doctrine of a coming Christ. The Father speaks not of himself, but of his Son. At last the Son came, but he did not speak of himself. He revealed the Father, and spoke of Another, a Comforter, to come. The Comforter came on the Day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit, true to the prophecy of Christ, spoke not of himself, but took of the things of Christ and showed them unto us. Each of the three Persons of the Trinity reveals the other. Is not this the office of the minister of Christ—not to speak

of himself but of Another? It was so with John the Baptist, whose motto was, "He must increase, and I must decrease."

The only way to get out of the ever-present consciousness of self is to get into the ever-present consciousness of union with Christ. His life is the perfect type of unselfishness. To use a phrase of Sidney Lanier, it is Jesus who leads the world in "selfless chivalry." A great college president used to exhort his students often, "I beseech you, resist the tyranny of self, accept duty as the law of life, and live in the will of God." It would be difficult to imagine a more perfect counsel, and it had its effect upon innumerable lives. The Christian religion is emphatic upon this point. "Lay not up *for yourselves* treasures on earth." "Seek not great things *for yourselves.*" Not until Life's center shifts from self to other-self have we begun to learn the meaning of the Master's mind.

GRACE OF MUTUAL FORGIVENESS—If ye forgive men, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you. —Matt. 6:14.

An exquisite illustration of the tender-heartedness of the apostolic church, showing how freely the disciples forgave one another, is found in that opening scene in the upper room, when Peter stood up to address them. All were conscious that they had forsaken the Lord and fled. Not one uttered a taunt against the comrade who had been found out. They distinguished at once between the unhallowed remorse of Judas and Peter's repentance. What changed Peter's despair into a saving faith was the Lord's look, his message, his personal interview. And how different would have been the drama if backbiting had occurred! In Paul's astonishing words to the Ephesians, the Holy Spirit would have been "grieved." Wind and fire are symbols of God—strong and terrible symbols—but how quickly sensitive to atmospheric conditions!

Those men and women, who are to us so illustrious, were for the most part rustic and unlettered. They spoke the Galilean dialect; and Paul, who could hold his own with Kings and statesmen, tells us plainly that God chooses simple folk, not the wise and learned, to be his followers. If Peter wrote letters that are now immortal in literature, if John's vision revealed for all time the mysteries of heaven and hell and destiny, it was because these men, with no discernible natural gifts, were educated in the Spirit. Their only books were the Old Testament, and if their reading was limited, it was the more thorough. Their university was life, their college was experience, their tutors were hardship and danger. Genius was only their final reward —a gift from Him in whom they drew every breath. It was the reward of the Spirit in which they read and pondered.

THE FAITH THAT OVERCOMETH—Upon whose bodies the fire had no power.—Dan. 3:27.

What was the secret of the fortitude of those young men? How were they able to withstand in that evil day? It was revealed 700 years later by the inspired hand that wrote the rollcall of heroes in the Seventh of Hebrews: "By faith they quenched the violence of fire."

And theirs was a singular faith. It was not built upon any promise, however great and precious; nor on any theological dogma, however true and worth standing for; but on a personal God. In him they relied so implicitly that, whether he delivered them out of the furnace or left them to glorify him by going up to heaven in a chariot of fire, they would in any case bow at no other shrine but his.

The faith that overcometh the world is faith in the personal God who has revealed himself in his beloved Son. He stands back of all truth, all righteousness, all promises, all reliances whatsoever; he is the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother, who in evil and good report never fails those who are loyal to him.

To live or die for him, what matters it? Ours be the faith that is ever able to say, "I know whom I have believed."

THE TYRANNY OF SIN—Verily I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin.—John 8:34.

Christ, the Truth, can make the world free from sin, but if we believe not him as the divine Saviour, we shall die in our sins. A physician said to a young man, "If you do not cut out your sins, you will be blind in six months." He replied, "Good-bye, sweet world of light; I cannot give up my sins." Lust was his master, he was the slave. Appetite clutched his throat like a demon. He was the bondman in prison; passions were his jailers.

Only one Liberator can save the soul from

e tyranny of sin. His name is called Jesus, r he shall save his people from their sins. saves the Magdalenes, the moral lepers, e thieves, defaulters, robbers, the persecu- rs, liars and idolators, the drunkards and urderers. He saves unto the uttermost all at come unto God by him.

Only two courses are open to the human aveler—salvation or slavery. Which shall be? Ages of peace or moments of pleas- e; harvests of fruitage or nothing but aves? Shall we follow Christ to freedom, surrender to the slavery of Satan? This the great question of human destiny. It ay be this night thy soul will be required thee—shall we still yield to the embrace monster passion, or seek the friendship of e mighty Deliverer? Hear him speak to ou: "He whom the Son makes free is free ideed. Without me ye can do nothing." If ou will seek first the Kingdom of God and s righteousness, all other things essential to ue happiness will be added unto you.

HE WORLD'S GREATEST PREACHER—Never man spake like this man.—John 7:46.

This is a great tribute, especially when we onsider that it was spoken about Jesus by s enemies. It is seldom that a man's ene- ies ever pay so great a compliment as this him. Of course there were great preach- s before Christ's time, and there have been reat preachers since his day.

The Old Testament taught the authority God. Men were to fear and obey him. esus came teaching the fatherhood of God, ying to lead men to love him. Christ is e only one who reveals to us God at his st. We now understand what Jesus ught: that we are not orphans in a world fate—we are children living in our Fath- 's earthly house, loving the One who cares ost for us.

If Christ revealed the greatness of God's ondescending love, he also revealed the reatness of man's ascending power. Just truly as God came down in Christ to man, an goes up through Christ to God. It was esus who discovered man's individual worth nd taught him how God cared for every an as a man. Christ also gave manhood a ew dignity, and showed the world the possi- lities of fellowship with God.

Sin had been thought of as a transgression the law—that is, an outward deed. Jesus ught that sin was more than that, and re- vealed it as an inward condition. He believed in the existence and power of sin. Sin is the greatest curse of the age, and this is the in- dictment which can be written across the skies: "All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God."

Jesus came with a message of hope, not to destroy the lost, but to seek and save them. He was willing to leave the ninety and nine and go out for the one. The redemption of man is the divine objective of God. Christ taught, lived and died that he might bring many sons home to glory.

THE BLESSEDNESS OF SERVICE—Who went about doing good.—Acts 10:38.

"Were you ready to die, that you jumped into a stormy sea to save that child's life?" said a gentleman to a sailor. "Should I have been better prepared, sir," the sailor replied, "if I had shirked my duty?" Doing one's duty is the noblest kind of readiness for death. This was the mission of our Lord: healing, saving, restoring and redeeming. "I come to do thy will, O God." To release the captive, to comfort all that mourn, to give beauty for ashes. Christ's followers are commissioned to carry on his Kingdom in the salvation that saves. We should have the spirit of compassion for the multitude, the burden for souls, the willingness to suffer, that we may help and comfort our brothers.

To be right and do right is a crown of glory that brightens in this world. What opportunities are before the Christian world today! Millions of our fellow men are in hunger and pain, are homeless and friendless. We should go or send to their relief. Don't say, "How shall I? Who is my neighbor?" Go and help immediately. You are your brother's keeper; therefore hurry to his relief. The needy world waits for saviours; be one.

It will not do merely to express a sigh of pity, a tear of sympathy; you must extend the personal touch. Then you will bless three—yourself, the needy one, and the Christ. Let us seek after the lost as Columbus sought for a lost continent, as Edison has searched for the wonderful forces of nature. What matters it if you suffer martyrdom for your belief and ambition? Remember, you are in a noble society, with Socrates poisoned, Paul beheaded, and Huss burned. These are they that came up out of great tribulation, but they came victors, with the cross carved upon their scepters of triumph and shining on their crowns of glory. They were more than conquerors, through him that went about doing good!

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, D.D., Long Pine, Nebraska

America should occasionally think rationally what we and the world owe to the Jews. It does not become a Christian land to discriminate against any race, much less against the Jewish race, to whom the world owes more than to any other race, now living or extinct. My limited space forbids all details. Let me mention just two, our conception of Jehovah God, and His gift to the world of the Saviour, Jesus, the Jew.

The Call of Abraham

Genesis 12:1-9

Abraham was well named "The Friend of God," and "The Father of the Faithful." God planned to save this sinful world; and to this end He chose a man to become the ancestor of a special nation, by which the world would receive the divine Saviour. Abraham was this man; and the Jews were the nation.

God called Abram first through his Father, Terah, who led the family from Ur of the Chaldees to Haran. Then He called Abram directly through his conscience, the point of contact between God and man. God often calls through His providences; but He called Abram through the inward voice, in words clear and meaningful. In my own personal experience I know He does call some to-day directly through the "still, small voice." When I was a boy on the farm, He spoke to me in words calm, yet intense with authority, "Be a Minister." There was no human being near me. I answered, *"No,"* very decidedly. I had a rank prejudice against such a life, which seemed to me like being buried alive. Again the voice said calmly, "Be a Minister." I recognized the source; and I answered, *"Yes."* Through all these years that experience has been vivid and radiant.

God called Abram to be a pioneer, not for personal wealth, but for worldwide service. "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." We see in this not only God's plan for Abram, but for the nation of his descendants. Has the Jewish nation yet fulfilled its mission fully? The great tragedy of its history is the rejection of their promised Messiah, by Whom they would have given a wonderful salvation to all the earth. If as a nation, as a people they would accept Jesus as their Christ, their day of triumph would speedily come. Like Jerusalem, they did not know the day of the visitation of Jehovah God, in their spiritual King, Jesus. Saul of Tarsus learned in time.

God's call comes to each of us, as truly as it came to Abram. He calls us by the life, deeds, and words of Jesus, by His death and His resurrection. He also calls us directly, whether we have or have not ears to hear Him.

Abraham and the Promised Land

Genesis 13:14-18

This promised land became the most valuable land in all the earth. Its position was strategic. It was the cross-roads of the world. It was given to Abraham, and became the land of the Jews, and the radiating center of the world's history; and all dates of events focus in Jesus, born in Bethlehem.

Abraham took possession of this land by actual residence. "Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for unto thee will I give it." To every child of man there is a promised land of attainment and achievement; but each one must personally appropriate all that he can possess. Thus we reach the possibilities, in some degree, of our knowledge, our character, our service.

Abraham gave his nephew his choice of the land; and Lot was selfish enough to accept this seeming advantage, and therefore suffered loss. Abraham showed himself the man; and Jehovah in approval gave him the whole land. "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth."

Abraham recognized God. "He dwelt by the oaks of Mamre, which are in Hebron; and *built there an altar unto Jehovah.*" This is the only way in which any person can come into his own. Our life is from God, and from Him comes every good gift. The life that is alienated from Him inevitably is a sad failure. The life that is daily linked up with God vitally, in worship and in service, cannot possibly be anything but an eternal success.

Abraham and Isaac

Genesis 22:1-19

The secret of Abraham's greatness is his *faith.* It was by faith that he left Haran,

not knowing where he was going; and faith was conspicuous in all his life. He was a true father of his people. To develop this faith and to make it a feature in his life for the instruction of all ages, God tested him in exceptional ways. The great faith is seen in his experience with Isaac. The birth of Isaac taxed the faith of both Abraham and Sarah. Then again when Isaac was grown enough to be able to walk a long distance, he went with his Father to Moriah, not knowing the purpose.

"In Isaac shall thy seed be called." Abraham had other children; but God's chosen nation was to be the descendants of Isaac. In this faith misdirected Abraham drove Hagar out of his home. Sarah was the more to blame. God overlooked this sin, saved Hagar, and made her son a great nation. All down the ages faith in God has been often wofully misdirected; and yet God has overruled even the mistakes of Faith, so that His Cause has not utterly failed.

In planning to sacrifice Isaac, Abraham went against his affection, went against his reason, hoping that somehow God would overrule his obedience for good and for the ultimate end. "God will provide Himself the lamb." He was sure that God had told him to do this thing, and his faith would not permit any detour. God honored his faith, and saved the situation. Often since then faith has acted blindly, in absolute surrender; and God has honored such faith, and man has recognized true heroes. Too much faith today hesitates and refuses to act, unless the end can plainly be seen. Where is faith?

Abraham willing to offer Isaac, because God commanded the sacrifice, is a type of God Himself, in being willing to sacrifice His Only Son. In this case no substitute was found; and Jesus willingly made the offering. God provided the Lamb; and all mankind may escape the consequences of sin because of the atonement, and the substitution effected by Jesus Christ.

By faith Abraham, before he died, took an oath of "his servant, the elder in his house," to go to his people in Mesopotamia, in the city of Nahor, and find there a wife for Isaac. The Lord prospered the mission, and "Isaac was comforted after his mother's death." And Rebekah became the mother of the ten thousands of Israel.

Abraham and the World

Hebrews 11:8-12

Abram's name was changed to Abraham, to signify that he was to become the Father of a great nation. "There sprang of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand which is by the seashore, innumerable." Abraham is a world-wide figure.

God's purpose for Abraham and his race is manifest, both in the Bible and in world-history. The Old Testament history reveals some of the facts shaped by Abraham and his race. Archaeology has revealed the history of Egyptians and Assyrians and other great nations; but there is none to be compared with the Jewish Nation for world influence. The Ten Commandments given to Moses have moulded the highest governments of earth and are now the basis of International Law. The Jewish conception of Jehovah God was the very highest conceived by man, and was developed by Jesus Christ into the Christian knowledge of our Father God. The literature of the Old Testament stands unequaled among the best of all other ancient civilizations. The Temple of Solomon today has an influence over millions, for good and for God.

"Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad" (John 8:56). The supreme influence of Abraham over the world was plainly outlined by Jesus in that memorable talk with the Jews, about their being "Abraham's seed" (John 8:31-59). All prophecy has a spiritual interpretation. The Jews would not accept Jesus nor His spiritual interpretation, because they were not spiritually minded. "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word."

"Lord, dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom of Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know times and seasons, which the Father hath set within His Own authority. *But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you"* (Acts 1:6, 7). This is the key to the correct understanding of all prophecy concerning the Jews.

There is only one possible way in which the Jewish Nation can come into its own, and that is by accepting Jesus Christ as their promised Messiah. Since they rejected Jesus their history has been a record of disaster and persecution, the direct and indirect result of crucifying Jesus Christ. They will again become God's Chosen People, when they accept Jesus as their Christ. Then will come in the fullness of the Gentile world; and Jesus Christ shall "see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied" (Isaiah 53:11).

LIBRARY TABLE

Reviews of Recent Books

By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

A Translation of Luke's Gospel, With Grammatical Notes. By A. T. Robertson, D.D.,LL.D. George H. Doran Company, New York. $2.50 net.

It would be easy to become adjectival over this book. Here we find no mutilation of the sacred text, no omissions of matters that might not agree with one's subjective views, as is the case with Charles Foster Kent's version. Dr. Robertson is an evangelical scholar. The story of the miraculous conception of Christ, His virgin birth, Mary's sweet and spiritual song, the song of the angels, the consecration of the Child in the temple, and all the other events recorded so simply and beautifully by St. Luke, are here given in full. The translation is made in clear and limpid modern English, thereby proving that Biblical Christians do not object to putting Christian truth in modern forms, providing the truth itself is not perverted and warped and twisted.

Through his excellent mastery of the New Testament Greek Dr. Robertson brings out the fine shades of meaning in the text, thus proving the accuracy and forcefulness of St. Luke as a writer. As he says, the present translation is intended to preserve "the delicate nuances of the Greek idiom." The book may be used with much profit for devotional reading; it may also be used in a critical way with the Greek text at hand and with constant reference to the author's grammatical notes in the back part of the book. The paragraphing is logical, and yet for convenience of reference and comparison, the verses are numbered as they are in the common versions.

Cyclopedia of Sermon Outlines. By Rev. Aquilla Webb, D.D.,LL.D. George H. Doran Company, New York. $3.00 net.

One does not need to praise this book as good for preachers only; it is excellent for laymen as well, and might be used most profitably for home and private devotional reading. The sermons are just the kind to comfort the heart and stimulate the spiritual life. They are not intensely doctrinal, never polemical, although, so far as we are able to judge, always true to the Word. They have been selected for spiritual uplift. One commendable distinction of the book is that the outlines are not bare skeletons, but are sufficiently expanded to make good reading. However, the divisions are always given in a homiletical way, so that they are real sermons, not mere religious essays.

For the minister this collection will be of great value for suggestions. Sometimes when the minister has a long pastorate, he feels pretty well exhausted when he thinks of what he shall preach next Sunday. He would not want to borrow any of these sermons, but he can read them to stir spiritual thought and feeling and bring himself *en rapport* with the preaching temper, and then it will be easy for him to compose sermons of his own. One matter impresses us greatly in looking over these homiletic outlines and seed-plots—what an inexhaustible treasure-trove we have in the Bible for texts for sacred discourse! Here, too, are the best interpretations of Scripture passages by many of the greatest preachers of the past and present. The book is a thesaurus of good things for the soul.

Paths in the Wilderness: A Story of Lutheran Pioneers in Georgia... By Rev. C. E. Sparks. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. $1.25.

Here is a thoroughly good story, interesting and wholesome. It is religious, but that is no reason why it should not be winsome and artistic. Yet there is no attempt at fine writing, nor at elaborate description, but the manner is so simple that the story almost reads itself. And it has adventure in it, too, in which there are really thrilling situations. A new kind of villain is described in this piece of fiction, and he was a real one, too, bent on committing desperate deeds; but what became of him? Well, that is different. Read the book and see. The story is laid principally in Georgia at the time when the Lutheran Saltzburgers settled at Ebenezer, and it is interesting to see General Oglethorpe, John and Charles Wesley and Pastor Boltzius

moving about on the stage as natural as life. The story is also informing, because it deals with real history. People of other than Lutheran persuasions will read the story with interest and without offense, for it casts no unkind reflections at other Christian people.

Twelve Great Questions About Christ. By Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago. $1.50.

There is nothing obscure or equivocal in this book. Dr. Macartney has a definite faith, and he knows how to state it in such clear terms that he who runs may read and understand. It is refreshing to read after a man who has such clear-cut and earnest convictions and knows how to impart them. There is nothing winding about his logic; it goes right straight from premise to conclusion like a well-aimed arrow. He does not deal with infidels. If he did, he would marshal his arguments in a different way. He deals with the modernists, who make shipwreck of many doctrines of the Christian faith, and then try to salvage as much as they can from the havoc they have wrought. Dr. Macartney proves by invincible argument step by step how untenable their position is. He shows that it is impossible to destroy the faith with one hand and preserve it with the other. One thing stands out clear in this book: the conservatives have the definiteness, the clarity, the consistency and the logic on their side. The haziness and the assertiveness are on the side of the modernists, who seldom argue, but deal for the most part in *ex cathedra* statements.

The chapters of the book deal with all the vital Christological questions—the virgin birth, the originality of Christ, His miracles, His deity, the atonement He wrought for sin, His resurrection, His ascension, and the agreement of His teaching and that of Paul. The last two chapters answer the vital questions: "Will another Jesus do?" and "Have new foes arisen against Christ?" The author does not deal in epithets; he is too earnest and serious for that; time and space are too precious. Now and then he puts a question to the modernists that must blister their consciences, but he uses no abuse. Dr. Machen's introduction is characteristic—it drives the arrow right home.

The Gaspards of Pine Croft. By Ralph Connor. George H. Doran Company, New York. $2.

Again we must say that we have little time for reading and reviewing works of fiction; but when the kindly publishers sent us Ralph Connor's story as a Christmas present, we felt that it must be worth reading. And it was. The fact might as well be confessed, it kept us up one night far beyond our usual time for retiring. It is a great story, full of life, action, fun and pathos. As you read, you burst into laughter again and again at some sally of wit or some grotesque situation. A few moments later you may be wiping the gland water surreptitiously from your eyes. Presently your interest is held taut by the graphic narrative of a stirring adventure. There is not a place in the story that is tame. Its religious element is good and wholesome. Paul, the hero, is a worthy successor of Guenn and other Connor creations. He has a virile orthodox faith that gives him strong ethical conceptions. Some theological difficulties troubled him for a while, but he overcame them. The tale is laid in the lovely Windermere valley along the upper reaches of the Columbia River, between two ranges of the Selkirk Mountains—a fine *locale* for romance and adventure. Connor (real name, Gordon) belongs to the romantic school of fiction writers, and so there is a good deal of idealism in his stories; but there are also much realism and solid common sense.

The Main Difference Between Positive and Liberal Theology. By Dr. O. Hallesby. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. Heavy paper cover, 50 cents.

Here is a book to place by the side of Dr. J. G. Machen's "Christianity and Liberalism." It is most interesting to note that both scholars come to the same conclusion regarding the vital and fundamental difference between evangelical Christianity and the so-called modernism in religion; yet one of them is an American and the other a Norwegian. Dr. Hallesby is a professor in the Independent Theological Seminary in Christiana, Norway. He visited this country last summer, and delivered a series of addresses at Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. They produced a profound impression, and have now been brought out in book form in both the Norwegian and the English. The translation into English has been done by Dr. G. T. Rygh, who is well known as an excellent English and Norwegian scholar. The translation is smooth and graceful.

The book is most enlightening. It shows that modernism is just the same in Norway as it is in this country, rationalistic, destructive, proud, boastful of superior learning con-

nected with evolution, shredding the Bible of everything that does not comport with the natural reason (of the rationalists), and yet wants to stay in the evangelical church, eat of its bread, and share in its emoluments. In a profound and thorough-going way the author points out the irreconcilable difference between the positive and liberalistic views, and indicates the perils of the latter, not only to Christianity, but to the civilization of the world. You will want to get this book; it is timely and instructive, and reveals the logical and ethical inconsistency of modernism. It is Christian in temper and solid in argumentation.

Human Nature in the Bible. By William Lyons Phelps, Lampron Professor of English Literature in Yale University. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $2.00.

Here is something that almost takes our breath away. It was a proverb in olden time, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Remembering Prof. Kent's atrocity, the Shorter Bible, and Prof. Bacon's spectacular biblical and theological breaks—the first in the University and the second in the Divinity School—we had almost ceased to expect that anything safe, sound, measurably orthodox, would come from the sons of Eli. But Professor Phelps treats the Bible, beginning with Genesis and so on all the way through, including the Apocrypha, with respect. We hear not a word about myths, sagas, folklore, traditions, literary inventions, and all that sort of stuff. He takes the Bible at its face value, just as though it were an honorable, honest production and tells the truth. He knows human nature, as almost any experienced college professor does, and as that is the unchanging factor in life—human nature being the same in all ages—he is able, with keen shrewdness, exquisite humor, often incisive wit, insight, foresight and hindsight, to vivify old-time characters that are little more than a name to most of us, and make them real, living, companionable humans. Really, it is one of the most enjoyable books we have read in a long time. If you want to add a new zest to your life; get it.—*W. H. B.*

The Bible versus the Secretary. By Rev. Franklin M. Sprague, A.M. The Stratford Company, Boston. $2.00.

This book, considering the restraint and yet consummate thoroughness with which the author has done his work, is little less than remarkable. The Secretary is not named, but since he has figured conspicuously in these columns, we see no reason why he should not be named. He is the Rev. Frank M. Sheldon, D.D., secretary of the Congregational Publishing Society, and also of the Congregational Education Society, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Sheldon published in *The Congregationalist* thirteen consecutive articles on the Bible, and while of course there are good things in them, there were so many decomposed flies in his ointment as to make it exceedingly malodorous. A New England Congregationalist wrote to this office pronouncing the writings "infidel stuff."

Our editor, Dr. George F. Wright, of the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* a Congregationalist, took Dr. Sheldon to task in an unsigned editorial in the CHAMPION, March 1921, p. 136, entitled "Heretical Ignorance in High Places." Editor Bates, not knowing what the other Editor was doing, administered vigorous correction to the Secretary's vagaries, but *The Congregationalist,* as so often in the case of communications that make for safe and sane biblicism and orthodoxy, turned the article down. It was printed —"Among the Congregationalists"—in the October 1921 CHAMPION, p. 374.

Dr. Sheldon was granted a "come-back" in the CHAMPION of November 1921, p. 425. There was appended to it a refutation of every one of the alleged Bible contradictions which the Secretary had declared "on his honor as a gentleman" *were* contradictions. Notwithstanding the complete refutation of these "contradictions," the thirteen articles have been published in booklet form, which has gone forth with the imprint of the Congregational denomination upon it endorsing the Secretary's outrageous errancies.

Mr. Sprague does not treat of these special alleged contradictions; so if one wants to see these answers he would better turn to November 1921 BIBLE CHAMPION. Mr. Sprague takes up the Secretary's rehash of the old hacknied objections and misinterpretations—rationalistic, theological, pseudo-scientific, etc.—that have been concocted by skeptics and that have troubled the church from the beginning down through the centuries, and in a calm, dignified, scholarly, conclusive way, shows their futility and falsity and disposes of them in a fashion that should confute unbelief, confirm faith in the divine verities, and cheer the hearts of all who desire to know the truth. Those who want to see this ground gone over in a convincing and satisfactory way cannot do better than to get this work.—*W. H. B.*

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles d in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at fol- ing rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 ds to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible ampion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

OR SALE—11 vols. Commentary by the glican Bishops $15.00; one set Exposition of le, 7 vols. $8.00; postpaid. Jno. Stauffer, Har- nburg, Va. 2-1

VANTED—"The Lord of Glory," by War- d. State price and condition. Geo. Hankamp, la, Iowa. 2-1

OR SALE—Complete set Homiletical Com- ntary on the Old Testament, 21 volumes, good new condition. Cost $60.00—will sell for $20 h. Address Homlletical, care Bible Champion ading, Pa.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, ols., morocco, $3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible ampion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS — Universal Encyclopedia, 6 s., cloth, cost $15—for $7.50; 6,000 Years of urch History, 10 vols., cloth, cost $15.00—for 50; Compendium Evangelical Theology, *Pass- re*, cost $3.00—for $1.25; American Bookman, *we*, cost $2.50—for $1.25; Professing Chris- ns, *Finney*, cost $1.75—for $1.00. All new from unused library and tops show a bit of shelf posure. Sent prepaid. Address, S. S. T., Bible ampion, Reading, Pa.

OR SALE — Letter Copying Press, perfect dition, like new, cost $8.00, for $2.50. Address, I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP — Prices parenthesis are what books cost new. The oken Seal, *Green*, ($1.50) for 35c; *Hamilton's* xican Hand Book, Ills., ($1.50) for 35c; Rela- ns of the Republic and Laws of Religious Cor- rations, *Kynett*, ($2.50) for 50c; Christ for lia, *Lucas*, ($2.00) for 50c; *Dewey's* Works, 2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. l sent *prepaid*. Address, O. P. R., Bible Cham- n, Reading, Pa.

BIBLE COMMENTARY—Just like new. nge's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, essalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for 50 any single vol., or $10 for the 8 vols. Pre- d east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible ampion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Lange's Commentary Job, cloth, *Schaff*, cost $3.00—for $1.75; Great- Life Work of Christ, *Patterson*, cost $1.50— ; Old Testament Introduction, *Raven*, cost 00, net—for $1.25; Preacher Problems, *Moore*, t $1.50, net—for 90c; Getting One's Bearings, *Kenzie*, cost $1.25, net—for 75c; The Fascina- n of the Book, cost $1.25, net—for 75c; Unsel- ness of God, *Smith*, cost $1.25, net—for 75c. sent prepaid. These are bargains. Address, A. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and acher—either bound or unbound. Name price l give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why ur Gospels." Give conditions and price. Ad- ss Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

WANTED — Volume "The Resurrection," by st. Address, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE — NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Ekholm*, ($1.50) for 90c; Mythical Inter- pretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, ($2.00) for $1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, ($1.75) for $1.10; Up in Maine, 6th Ed., *Day*, ($1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild*, ($1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, ($1.25) for 65c; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, ($1.50) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell*, ($1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Read- ing, Pa.

FOR SALE—Books like New. Figures in par- enthesis show what they cost. Will mail any book prepaid for 50c. Romance of Providence, ($1.50); Landmarks of the Evangelical Associa- tion, ($1.50); S. S. Movement in America, ($1.25); Science and Religion, ($1.00); Nature and Culture, ($1.00); How to Gesture, ($1.00); Modern Cities, ($1.00); Fifth Years, ($1.00); Henry Boynton Smith, ($1.00); Protestant Church in France, ($1.25). Address, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

CHEAP NEW BOOKS—Artists and Arabs, cost 75c—for 40c; A Study in Pedagogy, cost 75c —for 40c; S. S. Normal Class, cost 50c—for 25c; Yet Speaking, cost 50c—for 30c; Life's Every- dayness, cost 50c—for 30c; Supplemental Bible Study, cost 50c—for 30c; Good Tidings, cost 35c —for 20c; Environment, cost 25c—for 15c. Ad- dress, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP — Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley*, ($1.25) for 65c; Chosen of God, *Lathe*, ($1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, ($1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, ($1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, ($1.50) for 75c; Return of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, ($1.50) for 75c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torrey*, ($1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address, M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost $1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston;* Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin;* Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schlaff;* The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns;* Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter;* Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner;* Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter;* The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address, N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

LIKE NEW BOOKS—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, $1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo., $1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8 vo., $1.00; The Old Way, *Rhoads* 50c. All like new, *all prepaid*. Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—All Matters Tend to Rotatio, *Hamilton*, ($2.00) for $1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling*, ($1.00) for 50c; Sanc- tified Spice, *Peters*, ($.75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor* ($.75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social & Political Es- says, ($1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teach- ers, *Hillis*, ($1.50) for 75c; All prepaid. Address R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY

Every Bible student, pastor and Christian worker will appreciate receiving the reports of the Founder's Week Bible Conference, held at the Moody Bible Institute, February 4-8. A summary of the Conference will be published in the March number of the Moody Bible Institute Monthly. The addresses will be distributed over at least three issues: March, April and May.

Among the speakers are the following: Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary; Rev. Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; Rev. Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., Central Methodist Episcopal Church, Bridgeton, N. J.; Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D.D., Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Charleston, S. C.; Rev. W. Talbot Hindley, Vicar of St. John's Church, London; Rev. Henry W. Frost, Home Director of the China Inland Mission; Rev. Louis Entzminger, Forsythe, Georgia; Rev. W. W. Johnstone, D.D., Superintendent, Lakes District, American Sunday School Union; Miss Sara Wray, Superintendent of the Eighth Avenue Mission, New York City; Rev. R. H. Glover, M.D., Director of the Missionary Course of Moody Bible Institute; Rev. Harry L. Strachan, of the Latin America Evangelization Party.

Single Copy, 20c Three Months' Subscription, 50c

$2.00 a Year

ADDRESS

MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY

163 INSTITUTE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.

Bargains in Ladies' Hose

We have a few of Lot 1 left over—Nos. 9, 9½ and 10. Also a few of Lot 2—but only in size 10. *Both these lots are Exceptional Bargains.*

After taking Stock Account a large Hosiery manufacturer offered us several lots of Ladies' Hose to close out. We purchased these at Bargain prices, and will sell them at Bargain prices. One lot of Firsts, and another lot classed as Seconds because they had a fault but which was restored by their improved methods so that the fault is hardly perceptible and does not depreciate their wearing quality. They will wear equally as well as Firsts. We will sell these two lots at greatly reduced prices. They are *Real Bargains.*

Lot 1—A Sample lot of strictly Firsts—Drop stitch—not open; mercerized lisle, fine lustre, exceptionally good wearing quality; triple high spliced heel and toe, cord back, fine gauge, medium weight—very attractive. Black and Tan—sizes 9 and 9½. Made to sell at $5.00 per dozen. We sell them, while they last, at 30c. per pair, prepaid.

Lot 2—Seconds. Elastic tops, mercerized lisle, fine finish, triple high spliced heel and toe, fine gauge, medium weight, elastic tops, splendid wearing quality. Black and Tan—sizes 9 and 9½. Made to sell at $4.00 per dozen. We sell these, while they last, at 25c. per pair, prepaid. They are genuine bargains.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., READING, PA.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. $3 a year

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

Moses and the Monuments: Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times. Stone Lectures, 1919. 300 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid. (In press)

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth, $1.65, post paid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. 300 pp. 8vo, cloth, $2.15, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, $1.50, postpaid.

The Coup de Grace to the Wellhausen Critics.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages, 8vo, 40 cents, postpaid.

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

The Wellhausen Critics *in extremis.*

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings Upon the Antiquity of Man. 6th Edition. 210 illustrations. 808 pages, 8vo, cloth, $6.00, postpaid.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO., 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

OUR BOOK BARGAIN COUNTER

Good Books at half price. All bound in Cloth. All perfectly new.

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM

By JAS. McCOSH, D.D.,LL.D., Pres. Princeton College.
12 mo., 370 pp., $1.75

Special Price, 75 cents, prepaid

"The thinking is generally so clear, and the style so animated and luminous, that any person of average intelligence and culture may understand and enjoy the discussion; and no such person who has begun to read the work will be likely to rest satisfied till he has finished it. This book grapples directly with the vital questions. Every reader must admire its fairness."—*N. Y. Independent.*

PIVOT WORDS OF SCRIPTURE

By REV. PHILIP B. POWER, M.A. 353 pp.,$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

A pivot being a small point on which something else turns, the title of this volume seems to be very descriptive of those little words of Holy Scripture upon which turns the actual interpretation of a passage, and to which we are indebted for some of the most powerful teachings of God's word, whether they relate to His mercy or His wrath, as in cases of "for," "through," "yet," "then," "but," "and."

"It is pointed, crisp, fresh, and dealing with live issues."—Christian World.

CHRIST AND HIS RELIGION

By REV. JOHN REID, 12 mo., 311 pp., $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

Not an ingathering of threadbare suggestions, but a mine of fresh nuggets within the reach of all. There is a combination of depth of thought and simplicity of expression.

"Keen and clear conception of truth mark this volume. The author is a man of thought, and his calm and well-balanced views give a charm to his writing. There is a strength of truth in every page."—Christian Union.

VOICES OF THE SOUL ANSWERED IN GOD

By REV. JOHN REID, 374 pp., 4th Edition, $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

The soul needs a way to reach God, a way to become holy, a way to become happy. Hence the book is divided into three parts; it shows how the wants of the mind can be met in a Redeemer, Restorer, and Satisfier. Meditation must come first, then restoration, then satisfaction.

"That the soul of man can find its hopes realized, its want satisfied, its fears quieted and its measures filled in God alone, is the leading thought of this calm and powerful book. The presentation is most serious, original and suggestive."—N. Y. Observer.

ART AND MORALITY

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D.

Price, 25 cents, prepaid

A frank treatise by this popular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. Not all the beautiful actions of men can be called artistic, but the author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of his humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor.

"Sterling in sense."—West. Christian Advocate.

"A thoroughly instructive and readable volume."—United Presbyterian.

CONCESSIONS OF LIBERALISTS TO ORTHODOXY

By DAN'L DOCHESTER, D.D. 344 pp., $1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This work was originally prepared as a course of lectures, and was delivered before the School of Theology of Boston University. It is worthy of all commendation for the extensive research shown by the author, and the presentation of the three cardinal topics: The Deity of Christ, the Atonement, and Endless Punishment.

"A rich army for offensive and defensive warfare against theological error."—Religious Herald.

"The doctor's style is singularly pure and candid, and the diction and dignity, scholarship and research is manifest in every page."—West, Christ. Advocate.

FEATHERS FOR SHAFTS

OR READINGS IN THE BOOK. By J. BERG ESENWEIN, PH. D., LITT. D. Beautiful cloth, with gold design on side. 50 cents.

Special Price, 35 cents, prepaid

Choice Bible Reading by the author, assisted by leading American Bible Students: James H. Brookes, D.D., W. J. Erdman, D.D., Albert Erdman, D.D., Pastor D. M. Stearns, D. L. Moody, J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., C. H. Yatman and many others.

"The Bible Readings are diversified and comprehend most of the principal subjects claiming the attention of Christian people."—Christian World.

"Especially useful to persons who wish to conduct public Bible Readings or studies in the word of God in the social meeting. Get it."—Conference Herald.

"I WILLS" OF THE PSALMS

By REV. PHILIP B. BOWER, M. A. 404 pp., $1.25

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This devotional volume inspires Faith and Trust in time of need; is filled with forceful illustrations; is destined rather to suggest than to teach, though it does both. It is an elaborate treatment of the "I Will" of Trust, "I Will" of Power, "I Will" of Action, and the "I Will" of Praise. Written in very attractive manner, sympathetic and solicitous, by one devoted to the office of ministering to the saints. A book for the library, the home, the study table, being the determination of the man of God, as found in some of the "I Wills" of the Psalms.

"It is a real mine of suggestiveness."—Churchman.

THE HUMAN FLOWER

A simple statement of the Relation of Sexes.
By ELLIS ETHELMER

Cloth, 12 mo., 50 cents, prepaid

Julia McNair Wright, the well-known authoress, says: "The book, in chaste, elegant, clear, simple, thorough fashion, treats of animal, especially human, generation and birth, giving the subject the same clear, pure dignified treatment hitherto reserved for that other half of biological study, the study of plant life. This book teaches the parents much that parents do not know and have to teach the child. It is a book to be in every home, and in plain sight."

"A delicate subject is dealt with in a plain, straight-forward way, but without the slightest coarseness."—Glascow Herald.

"Pure, strong and true, a book to be welcomed by parents."—N. Y. Christian Advocate.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Reading, Pa.